

VOL. XXII. (XLI.)  
1881.

[THIRD SERIES.]

No. LXXXVI. (CC.)  
FEBRUARY.

# THE MONTH

AND

*Catholic Review.*



LONDON:

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.  
BURNS AND OATES.

DUBLIN: W. H. SMITH AND SON; M. H. GILL AND SON.

GLASGOW: H. MARGEY. PARIS: A. XAVIER.

BALTIMORE: JOHN B. PIET. NEW YORK: P. O'SHEA.

NEW YORK AND MONTREAL: D. AND J. SADLER.

---

Price Half-a-Crown.

*All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.*

**JOHN HARDMAN AND COMPANY,**  
*BIRMINGHAM,*  
**Metal Workers in Silver, Brass, and Wrought Iron,**  
 GAS FITTERS,  
 ENGRAVERS OF MEMORIAL BRASSES,  
**Artists in Stained Glass and mural Decorators,**  
*Medallists, &c.*

MESSRS. J. HARDMAN AND CO. having lately rebuilt their Show Rooms in London, and made considerable improvements and additions to them, have now a much larger stock of Art Metal Work on view, of which they respectfully invite an inspection from Architects and all who are interested in Ecclesiastical Art.

LONDON ADDRESS:  
**13, KING WILLIAM STREET, STRAND, W.C.**

AGENTS:  
 BURNS AND OATES, 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.

PRIZE MEDAL.—INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION, 1862.

Under the patronage of His Eminence the CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.

JURORS' REPORTS—WAX AND CHURCH CANDLES—EXCELLENCE OF QUALITY.

HIS LATE EMINENCE CARDINAL WISEMAN,

In a letter addressed to FRANCIS TUCKER and Co., on the subject,

**W**AX CANDLES WITH PLAITED WICKS, says: "I have found them fully equal to the recommendation you gave them, and can sincerely, in my turn, recommend them to the clergy for the use of the altar."

Finest quality, with Plaited Wick, patented, 2s. 2d. per lb. Second quality, ditto, 2s. per lb.

Two Pence per lb. charged extra if a credit be taken over Three Months.

PRIZE MEDAL, VEGETABLE CANDLES.

Best quality, 1s. 5d. per lb. Second quality, 1s. 3d. per lb. Third quality, 1s. 1d. per lb.

One Penny per lb. charged extra if a credit be taken over Three Months.

Carriage paid to the nearest country Railway Station on Orders not less than Five Pounds in value.

**FRANCIS TUCKER & CO.,**

South Molton Street, Grosvenor Square. Manufactory: Kensington (Established 1730). The only Catholic Establishment in England for the Manufacture of Wax Candles for the use of the Altar.

ESTABLISHED 1851.

**BIRKBECK BANK, SOUTHAMPTON BUILDINGS, CHANCERY LANE.**  
 Current Accounts opened according to the usual practice of other Bankers, and Interest allowed on the minimum monthly balances when not drawn below £25. No commission charged for keeping Accounts.

The Bank also receives money on Deposit at Three per cent. Interest, repayable on demand.

The Bank undertakes for its Customers, free of charge, the custody of Deeds, Writings, and other Securities and Valuables; the collection of Bills of Exchange, Dividends, and Coupons; and the purchase and sale of Stocks and Shares.

Letters of Credit and Circular Notes issued. A Pamphlet, with full particulars, on application.  
 31st March, 1880. FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager.

*The Birkbeck Building Society's Annual Receipts exceed Four Millions.*

**H**OW TO PURCHASE A HOUSE FOR TWO GUINEAS PER MONTH, with Immediate Possession and no Rent to pay.—Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK BUILDING SOCIETY.

**H**OW TO PURCHASE A PLOT OF LAND FOR FIVE SHILLINGS PER MONTH, with Immediate Possession, either for Building or Gardening purposes.—Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK FREEHOLD LAND SOCIETY.

A Pamphlet, with full particulars, may be had on application.  
 Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane.

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager.







**A LIST OF BOOKS**

**WRITTEN OR EDITED**

**BY**

**Fathers of the Society of Jesus.**

**LONDON: BURNS AND OATES,  
PORTMAN STREET AND PATERNOSTER ROW.**

**TO BE HAD ALSO AT**

***St. Joseph's Library, 48, South Street, Grosvenor Square, W.***

NEW VOLUME OF THE QUARTERLY SERIES.

---

Now Ready.

PRICE 6s. 6d.

(WITH PORTRAIT AND ILLUSTRATIONS).

*The Life of*  
*Mother Mary Teresa Ball,*

FOUNDESS OF THE IRISH BRANCH OF THE INSTITUTE OF THE  
BLESSED VIRGIN, LORETTO ABBEY, RATHFARNHAM.

By the REV. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J.

*With a Prefatory Letter by the Most Rev.*

THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

LONDON AND DUBLIN :

BURNS AND OATES. M. H. GILL AND SON.

Works by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge.

*Vita Vitæ Nostræ meditantibus proposita.*

Cloth, 7s. 6d. ; calf 10s. 6d.

[This volume is a Latin Harmony of the Gospels, arranged in parts and sections according to the chronological order of our Lord's life.] *Only a few copies remaining.*

*The Life of our Life.* Two vols. 15s.

[This volume is an English version of the above, with two introductory chapters to each Part of the Life, explaining first the general history, and secondly the part taken by each Evangelist in recording it. Notes illustrating the Harmonistic difficulties in each Part of the Life are also subjoined.]

CONTENTS.

VOL. I.

Preface.—On the Harmony of the Gospels.

Chapter I.—The Life of our Blessed Lord as independent of its records.

Chapter II.—Divisions of the Life of our Lord in the Gospels.

Chapter III.—Earlier Mysteries of our Lord's Life.

Chapter IV.—The Infancy and Hidden Life as related in the Gospels.

Chapter V.—Harmony of the Gospels as to the first part of the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Chapter VI.—First period of our Lord's Public Life.

Chapter VII.—The first stage of our Lord's Ministry in the four Gospels.

Chapter VIII.—Harmony of the Gospels as to the first period of our Lord's Public Life.

Note I.—Harmonistic Questions as to the first period of our Lord's Public Life.

Chapter IX.—Second period of our Lord's Public Life.

Chapter X.—The second stage of the Public Life in the four Gospels.

Chapter XI.—Harmony of the Gospels as to the second period of the Public Life.

Note II.—Harmonistic Questions as to the second period of our Lord's Public Life.

Appendix.—On the Theology of the Parables.

VOL. II.

Chapter I.—Third period of our Lord's Public Life.

Chapter II.—The third stage of the Public Life in the four Gospels.

Chapter III.—Harmony of the Gospels as to the third period of the Public Life.

Note I.—Harmonistic Questions as to the third period of our Lord's Public Life.

Chapter IV.—First days of Holy Week.

Chapter V.—The first days of Holy Week in the four Gospels.

Chapter VI.—Harmony of the Gospels as to the first days of Holy Week.

Note II.—Harmonistic Questions as to Holy Week.

Chapter VII.—The Passion of our Lord.

Chapter VIII.—The Passion in the four Gospels.

Chapter IX.—Harmony of the Gospels as to the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Note III.—Harmonistic questions as to the Passion.

Chapter X.—Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord.

Chapter XI.—Resurrection and Ascension in the four Gospels.

Chapter XII.—Harmony of the Gospels as to the Resurrection and Ascension.

Note IV.—Harmonistic questions as to the Resurrection and Ascension.

*The Public Life of our Lord. Part I.*

Vol. 1. THE MINISTRY OF ST. JOHN BAPTIST.

Vol. 2. THE PREACHING OF THE BEATITUDES.

Vol. 3. THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT (*to the end of the Lord's Prayer*).

Vol. 4. THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT (*concluded*).

Vol. 5. THE TRAINING OF THE APOSTLES (Part I).

Price 6s. 6d. each.

[These five volumes contain a full commentary on the Second Part of the *Life of our Lord*, that is, on the First Part of the *Public Life of our Lord*. The volumes on the *Infancy*, the First Part of the *Life of our Lord*, and in continuation of the *Public Life*, are in preparation.]

*The Sermon on the Mount. Three vols.*

(the second, third, and fourth vols. of the above bound up separately).

*The History of the Sacred Passion. By Father*

Luis de la Palma, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the Spanish. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. Fourth Edition. Price 7s. 6d.

*The Dialogues of St. Gregory the Great.*

An Old English Version. Edited by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. Price 6s.



### Biographies.

---

*The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier.*

By the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. Two vols. Third Edition. Price 18s. [N.B.—A cheap edition in one vol. is in the Press.]

*The Story of St. Stanislaus Kostka.* Edited

by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. 3s. 6d.

*The Chronicle of St. Anthony of Padua,*

'The Eldest Son of St. Francis.' Edited by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. In Four Books. Price 5s. 6d.

*The Life of St. Jane Frances Fremyot de*

*Chantal.* By Emily Bowles. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. Second Edition. Price 5s. 6d.

*The Life of St. Thomas of Hereford.* By

R. Strange, S.J. Price 6s. 6d.

*The Life of the Blessed Peter Favre,* First

Companion of St. Ignatius Loyola. From the Italian of Father Boero. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. Price 6s. 6d.

*The Life of the Blessed John Berchmans.*

By the Rev. F. Goldie, S.J. Second Edition. Price 6s.

---

*A Gracious Life,* being the Life of Barbara

Acarie (Blessed Mary of the Incarnation), of the Reformed Order of our Blessed Lady of Mount Carmel. By Emily Bowles. Price 6s.

*An English Carmelite.* The Life of Catharine

Burton, Mother Mary Xaveria of the Angels, of the English Teresian Convent at Antwerp. Collected from her own writings and other sources by Father Thomas Hunter, S.J. Price 6s.

*The Life of Mother Margaret Mostyn,* Prioress

of the Discalced Carmelites of Lierre, Flanders. Edited from the Manuscripts preserved at Darlington, by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. Price 6s.

(N.B. The first volume of *The Life and Letters of St. Teresa*, by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, will be ready immediately).

*The Life of Anne Catharine Emmerich.* By Helen Ram. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S.J. Price 5s.

*The Life of Doña Luisa de Carvajal.* By Lady Georgiana Fullerton. Price 6s. [Out of print. A new edition in preparation].

*The Life of Pope Pius the Seventh.* By M. Allies. Price 6s. 6d.

*The Life of Christopher Columbus.* By Rev. A. G. Knight, S.J. Price 6s.

*The Life of Henriette d'Osseville* (in Religion, Mother Ste. Marie), Foundress of the Institute of the Faithful Virgin. Edited by J. G. MacLeod, S.J. Price 5s. 6d.

*Three Catholic Reformers of the Fifteenth Century.* I. St. Vincent Ferrer. II. St. Bernardine of Siena. III. St. John Capistran. By Mary H. Allies. Price 5s.

*The Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions.* From documents hitherto unpublished. By the Rev. Alfred Weld, S.J. Price 7s. 6d.

*The sufferings of the Church in Brittany during the Great Revolution.* By Edward Healy Thompson. Price 6s. 6d.

*The Life of King Alfred the Great.* By the Rev. A. G. Knight, S.J. Price 6s.

---

*The Manna of the Soul.* Meditations for Every Day in the Year. By Father Segneri, S.J. Four vols. Price 29s.

Vol. 1. January—March. Price 6s. 6d.

Vol. 2. April—June. Price 7s. 6d.

Vol. 3. July—September. Price 7s. 6d.

Vol. 4. October—December. Price 7s. 6d.

---

*Preces Xaverianæ.* Price 1s. 6d.

1. Devotions for the Ten Fridays in honour of St. Francis Xavier.
2. Daily Exercise of a Christian, by St. Francis Xavier.
3. The Novena in honour of St. Francis Xavier.
4. Other Meditations for the Ten Fridays.

Sermons by Fathers of the Society of Jesus.

---

*Vol. 1. Sermons by the Rev. FF. Coleridge,*  
Hathaway, Gallwey, Parkinson, and Harper. Price  
6s. 6d.

*Vol. 2. Sermons by Rev. Fr. Harper.* Price  
6s. 6d.

*Vol. 3. Sermons by Rev. FF. Kingdon, Pur-*  
brick, Coleridge, Weld, and Anderdon. Price 6s. 6d.

---

*Pietas Mariana Britannica.* A history of  
English Devotion to the Most Blessed Virgin Marye,  
Mother of God, with a Catalogue of Shrines, Sanc-  
tuaries, Offerings, Bequests, and other Memorials of  
the Piety of our Forefathers, by Edmund Waterton,  
F.S.A., Knight of the Order of Christ, of Rome.

Price One Guinea.

---

*The Virtues of Our Lord Jesus Christ.* By  
Father Francis Arias, S.J.

1. The Virtue of Charity. Price 3s.

---

Translations edited by the Rev. P. Gallwey.

SELECT WORKS OF THE VENERABLE FATHER  
NICHOLAS LANCICIUS, S.J.

*Vol. 1. The Yearly Eight Days' Retreat and*  
how to profit by it. Price 6s. 6d.

*Just published.*

*Vol. 2. On Rash Judgment.*  
*On Aridity in Prayer.* Price 6s. 6d.

Periodicals edited by Fathers S.J.

MONTH AND CATHOLIC REVIEW.

*Subscriptions: Yearly, 30s.; Single Numbers, 2s. 6d.*

CONTENTS FOR FEBRUARY, 1881.

ARTICLES, &c.:—

1. When George the Fourth was King. No. VII.  
*By Percy Fitzgerald.*
2. Creator and Creature. Part the Third. *By the Rev. John Rickaby.*
3. Louvois and the French Army. Part the First.
4. A History of our own Times.
5. Poisoning the Wells. *By the Rev. Richard F. Clarke.*
6. Agrarian Contests in Ancient Rome. *By Robert Beauclerk.*
7. Passages from the Life of a Yorkshire Lady.  
Part the Second.  
Chap. XII.—The first House in London.  
" XIII.—A Just Soul.  
" XIV.—A Message to Rome and its Answer.

CATHOLIC REVIEW.

- I. Notes on the Press: 1. Letter of the Holy Father to the Archbishop of Dublin. 2. "The Case of Ireland stated." 3. Ritualists out of Prison. 4. The last session of the Congregation *De Auxiliis*.  
Note to the article on "Saints Barlaam and Josaphat."
- II. Reviews: 1. The Life of Henri-Marie Boudon, Archdeacon of Evreux. 2. A Year's Meditations. *By Mrs. A. Craven.* 3. *Dissertationes Selectæ in Historiam Ecclesiasticam.* Auctore Bernardo Jungmann.

III. Notices.

All Advertisements to be sent to Messrs. BURNS and OATES,  
17, Portman Street, W.

MESSANGER OF THE SACRED HEART.

No. LXX. (CLVI.). VOL. XXVII.

*Price Sixpence. Post free for Seven Shillings a Year.*

CONTENTS FOR FEBRUARY.—"Mi cha el." The Ursulines in Canada (IX. The new Monastery. X. Mother St. Joseph. XI. The closing days of the two Foundresses). The Cardinal's Niece (Part the Second). Our Lady of Peninha. Henri-Marie Boudon (Part the First). A Discourse of the Holy Father. Intention for the Apostolate of Prayer for February—The Holy Father and the Episcopate. The Holy League of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

ST. JOSEPH'S LIBRARY, 48, SOUTH STREET, GROSVENOR SQ., W.  
Where Subscriptions for the current year should now be paid.

*The trade should apply to MESSRS. BURNS AND OATES.*

## *When George the Fourth was King. No. VII.*

---

WE turn now to describe some brilliant pageants which distinguished the reign of this monarch. These were the splendid and exciting progresses through Ireland and Scotland, his visit to his German dominions—and the coronation.

The news that the King was coming to Ireland caused unbounded excitement in that portion of his dominions, of which evidence is found in the fact that the religious parties agreed to hold a truce for the occasion, the Lord Mayor sending a message to Lord Fingal to announce that "King William's statue should not be dressed" on the usual occasion. All united in the joyful preparations. Sir Benjamin Bloomfield, who had been despatched as *avant courier*, was *fêted* at a public dinner of all factions, at which he struck the key-note of the general rapturous strain which was to characterize future proceedings, declaring that "no sooner was the crown on his master's head than he had determined to visit Ireland." Lord Sidmouth, the Secretary of State, though starting later, arrived at the Phoenix a little in advance, where was Mr. Charles Grant, the Irish Secretary, who was entertaining Lord Londonderry and the Ministers in attendance on the King. His Majesty started from Carlton House on July 31, 1821, "at twenty minutes before twelve," and at half-past five arrived at Portsmouth, where he instantly went on board his own "yatch," as it was spelled then, the *Royal George*. But a most tedious and disagreeable journey was before him, and not until a fortnight was he able to set foot on Irish soil. On reaching Holyhead news that the Queen was almost *in extremis* reached him, and the King determined to go to his friend Lord Anglesey—"Paget"—whose place was close by, and wait for news.

*The King to Sir W. Knighton.*

Off Holyhead, August 10, 1821.

Dearest Friend,—As I know you like brevity in writing, I shall endeavour to be as concise as possible, and shall try to convey to you all the matter possible in the smallest compass.

VOL. XXII. (NEW SERIES). FEBRUARY, 1881.

L

I must first thank you for your kind letters, the last of which I have now just received. You need not be under any apprehension that every regard to decorum and decency will not be strictly observed.

I have now been at anchor in this harbour ever since Monday night at half-past eleven, when we received the first intimation of the Queen's indisposition.

On Tuesday at noon, as I had heard nothing from my friend Lord Sidmouth, who had passed over to the other coast some hours before, we took up our anchorage here. We had reason to know he had heard the report before he left Holyhead; and it was determined, as the best medium-line that could be adopted until I could hear from him, that I should proceed for twelve hours to Lord Anglesea's.

Accordingly I wrote to Lord Sidmouth and Bloomfield, to acquaint them with the communication I had received respecting the Queen, to account for the delay in my not proceeding to Ireland, and desiring Lord Sidmouth's advice as to what I had best do, and that he would make all the arrangements which might be necessary under existing circumstances.

I returned from Plasnewydd to my yacht here about four o'clock on the next day (Wednesday), and found Lord Sidmouth just disembarked and ready to receive me. He stayed about two hours with me on board, and then again took his passage in the steamboat, having arranged with me, that if the accounts from London of the Queen the next day should represent her to be in an improved state, that then we should set sail as quickly as possible, and land at Dunleary, and make my public *entrée* at Dublin on that day (Friday); although he had already taken measures for a private entry if matters should be worse, as it was utterly impossible for me under any circumstances not to proceed now to Ireland, where public notice would be given that I should observe the strictest privacy for some days, until we were acquainted either with the Queen's recovery or her demise, and till after the body should be interred.

Lord Londonderry fortunately arrived the next morning after Lord Sidmouth left me—that is to say, yesterday, Thursday, before seven o'clock in the morning—and has remained with me, and will continue to do so till I have set my foot on the Irish shore. He approved of all the arrangements I had made with Lord Sidmouth as the best possible, and with every view I had taken of the whole circumstance: and it is now determined that either in the course of the day, or as soon as possible as the wind and weather will permit (but which at present does not appear very encouraging), we are to set sail, either in the yacht alone or by steam, to Ireland; to make Howth (about five miles from Dublin), and to proceed without any sort of show or display to the Phoenix Park, without entering or passing through Dublin at all. My arrival there will then be publicly announced, and that the strictest privacy for a few days will be observed, as far as proper decency and decorum may require; and that after that, the day will be announced



when I shall make my public *entrée*, and when all public ceremonies and rejoicings will commence.

Continue, I conjure you, from time to time, and constantly if you can, to let me hear from you, be it only that "all is well;" for even this is a security and comfort to me that you cannot imagine: it is utterly impossible for me to tell you how uncomfortable and how miserable I always feel when I have you not immediately at my elbow. You may, then, judge what I do now at this moment feel, and what I have gone through without you near me, during all these recent perplexities and difficulties. You are too well acquainted with the warmth of my feelings towards you to render it necessary for me to add a syllable more upon that head, dear and best of friends, except that I am always

Most affectionately yours,

G. R.

The news of the Queen's death soon followed, and Lord Sidmouth, fearful of some unbecoming step being taken, hurried over to Holyhead, to press on his Majesty the necessity of a decent retirement, for a short space at least.<sup>1</sup> Nothing could be more unfortunate; but it was curious that her illness seems to have commenced on the very day that the King set off, on which evening she went to the theatre to see Mr. Kean's performance.

On the following Sunday, the 12th of August, crowds were looking out to the sea at where Kingstown now is, and Sir Benjamin was observed to be hurrying to the point of old Dunleary Harbour, then newly opened, but now an old colliers' shelter. Presently "the *Lightning* steam-packet, Capt. Skinner," was seen to approach, and the anxious crowds rushing forward recognized the familiar, portly figure. "A quarter before three," says a loyal rapturous account, "they descried by glasses a steam-vessel, which, from the circumstances mentioned, excited strong sensations; about twenty minutes after, a second steam-vessel seemed to approach in the same course: no doubt remained but his Majesty or some word from him would arrive in a short time. Within a few minutes of four the steam-packet closed in with "Ireland's Eye," and immediately the royal carriage, which had taken Sir Benjamin Bloomfield down, was seen driving rapidly to the pier head. At half-past four, the

<sup>1</sup> It seems to have been an anxious business, as the Secretary wrote to Mr. Hobhouse that "he would not trouble him with a detail of difficulties and vexations he had to deal with; but he endeavoured to reconcile himself to the service in which he was engaged," &c.

*Lightning* steam-packet, Capt. Skinner, came to the projection in the west point of the pier. A breathless suspension of two minutes succeeded, the anxious hearts of the spectators beating high. At length some person, recognizing his Majesty on board, cried, 'The King!' when all enthusiastically exclaimed, 'The King! the King! God bless him.' Cheers echoed and re-echoed, which his Majesty on hearing, stood forward and warmly returned, taking off his cap and winding it several times over his head. He was dressed in a blue frock, blue pantaloons, Hessian boots, a black cravat, white silk gloves, and a foraging cap with gold lace. His Majesty was a little browned from the weather. With him were Lords Londonderry, Thomond, Mount Charles, Francis Cunningham, and Mr. Freeling, Secretary to the Post Office. A small ship ladder covered with carpeting was fixed to facilitate his landing. Some of his suite preceded his Majesty. When he reached the top of the ladder, which he did with great agility and without assistance, the pressure was so great that he was much incommoded. This could not be avoided; as almost every person present stood on the small tongue of land which projects from the pier, through them no convenient passage could be opened without forcing some persons into the water. His Majesty bore the inconvenience with much good humour, perceiving the cause. On seeing the Earl of Kingston, his Majesty exclaimed, 'Kingston, Kingston, you black-whiskered, good-natured fellow, I am happy to see you in this friendly country.' Having recognized Dennis Bowes Daily, he cordially shook hands with him, who in the very act was deprived of a watch valued sixty guineas and a pocket-book. Sir Benjamin Bloomfield having opened the door of the carriage, his Majesty stepped in: the cheers of all rent the air. Having turned round, and extending forth both his hands, he said with great emotion, 'God bless you all; I thank you from my heart.' Seemingly exhausted, he threw himself back again, and on the cheers being repeated, taking off his cap, bowed again and again. The cavalcade then drove straight to the lodge at the Phoenix, a distance of about eight or nine miles. On reaching the entrance to the demesne, some halted outside, fearing that proceeding further would be an intrusion. His Majesty, perceiving the delicacy, put out his hand and exclaimed, 'Come on, my friends.' Some of those who entered, having walked on the grass, were reprimanded by others for so doing. 'Oh!' said his Majesty, good humouredly, 'don't mind

the grass ; let them walk where they please.' Having alighted from his carriage at the hall of the lodge, he addressed those round him, about a hundred in number, in the following words : 'In addressing you, I conceive I am addressing the nobility, gentry, and yeomen of Ireland. This is one of the happiest moments of my life. I feel pleased, being the first of my family that set foot on Irish ground. Early in my life I loved Ireland, my heart was always with them. I rejoice at being amongst my faithful Irish friends. I always considered them such, and this day proves to me I am beloved by them. Circumstances of a delicate nature, to which it is needless to advert, have precluded me from visiting you sooner. I have had a fatiguing voyage. If I do not express myself as warmly as I ought, I beg you will not attribute it to want of affection. I am obliged to you for the kindness you evinced towards me this day ; rank, station, and honour are nothing ; to feel that I live in the hearts of my Irish subjects, is to me the most exalted happiness. I assure you, my dear friends, I have an Irish heart, and will this night give a proof of my affection towards you, as I am sure you will towards me, by drinking your health in a bumper of whiskey punch.'"

Such was this amazing harangue, which produced a singular impression. The only disagreement was the arrival of the irrepressible Sir William Curtis, whose loyalty seemed, in this and the Scotch visit, to compete with the King for public attention. It was found that with his yacht he had taken up the best "berth" in Dunleary Harbour, from which he was promptly removed.

Then set in a tumult of excited demonstrations, to which the impulsive King lent himself, declaring "that he had never felt himself a King till that time," as well as the no less excited crowd, who acted and reacted on one another to an extraordinary degree.

On the 17th, which time it was thought had exhausted the tribute due to bereavement, he entered Dublin in state. The procession was brilliant with banners, music, and show, his Majesty, seated in an open barouche drawn by eight, repeatedly pointing to an enormous shamrock displayed in his hat. In the midst of the shouts, he declared to Sir B. Bloomfield "he might be proud of his country: they are a noble people." At the Castle windows, as he looked on the acclaiming multitudes, he was observed to shed tears. Then followed illuminations,

reviews, visit to the theatre, ball at the Mansion House, where a number of gentlemen improvized a body-guard, devising a uniform for the occasion, showing they knew one of the Sovereign's weaknesses. "A silk doublet of coronation blue reached half way down the thigh, white casimere breeches, white silk stockings with blue rosettes at the knees and shoe ties formed the lower part of the dress, round the waist a pink silk sash, from which hung a rich dress sword and sword-knot, round the neck a white ruff, under which lay a broad pink ribbon, from which hung a coronation medal. The hat was blue, with the leaf turned up before with a large plume of blue and white ostrich feathers. The weapon was a battle-axe, with a spear-head of burnished silver. As the King passed they shouldered their axes, and the lines had an imposing effect."

A magnificent circular ball-room of great size, still used for the Lord Mayor's balls, had been erected. After a handsome entertainment, the King retired, when speeches were made by Lord Londonderry and others, an alderman being so far carried away by his feelings as to give, "The glorious, immortal, and pious memory," which had nearly shipwrecked all. The King was infinitely displeased, but the matter was arranged. Then followed a visit to Slane, Lord Conyngham's place; an entertainment given by Trinity College, set off by music and such loyal tunes as "Rule Britannia." "They had scarcely commenced the first line of that inspiring anthem, when the royal countenance glowed with peculiar animation. At the words, 'the charter of the land,' his Majesty, *slowly raising his right arm*, and looking impressively at the assemblage of persons, seemed to renew in the only manner in which the Constitution would admit, the solemn compact that had been so recently entered into between the King and his people. During the chorus of each stanza the monarch's feelings uniformly assumed a higher tone, *moving his hand*, and *keeping time with the orchestra*, until the choir came to that part which prophetically declares that 'Britons never shall be slaves,' when, in the glorious fervour of his wishes for the happiness of the inhabitants of the realm, *he vigorously struck the table at every word*." This was characteristic, and indeed all his behaviour through these pageants deserved the praise of being truly natural, though scarcely dignified. He generally wore a field marshal's uniform. At the Rotunda ball, we are told, "our fair countrywomen and gallant beaux were so much overawed with

the presence of Majesty, that they completely bungled their evolutions, which did not escape his penetration, for he was pleased to observe 'that in whatever else the Irish can distinguish themselves, they had no pretensions to dancing.'

"I will here mention an anecdote, which is one of the many instances of his Majesty's condescension. One of the attendants happened to go into the room where his Majesty was, at the Curragh, to look for Earl Talbot's hat, when the man incautiously took up the King's and was going away with it, his Majesty perceiving him, good humouredly called out, 'Stop! stop! my friend, that is my hat; you must not take it.'

"Before his Majesty left the course, he presented a superb whip to the Duke of Leinster, and on handing it, turned round to Capt. Browne, the ranger. 'Mr. Browne,' said his Majesty, 'I intend this whip to be presented to the owner of the best horse in Ireland, weight for age, and I wish you to fix the weight and draw up an article according to which it is to be run for, and in addition to this whip, which is to be run for every year, I give a stake of one hundred guineas annually, as I wish to encourage the breed of strong horses in this country. You will take care to make the weights very heavy, and that no horse younger than four years old will be permitted to run for it.'

After a visit to Powerscourt, in the county of Wicklow, he laid his hand on Lord Fingall's shoulder, saying, "To-morrow you shall see my letter. I think it will please." An allusion to a sort of proclamation of liberal treatment for the Catholics.

Finally, on Monday, September the 3rd, the King embarked amid the most rapturous demonstrations and some eccentric displays. At the edge of the shore, his Majesty declared, in answer to an address, and much affected: "'Gentlemen, I approached your shores with pleasure—I now quit them with regret. May God Almighty bless you all until we again meet.' Mr. O'Connell, with a deputation of ten others, on his knees, presented to his Majesty a laurel crown. His name was announced by Lord Sidmouth. The King took particular notice of this distinguished personage, shook him cordially by the hand, and accepted the tribute. Mr. O'Connell was loudly cheered as he retired. Before his Majesty descended the royal slip, appearing much affected, he addressed those around him: 'My friends! when I arrived in this beautiful country, my heart overflowed with joy—it is now depressed with sincere sorrow.'



I never felt sensations of more delight than since I came to Ireland—I cannot expect to feel any superior nor many equal, till I have the happiness of seeing you again. Whenever an opportunity offers wherein I can serve Ireland, I shall seize on it with eagerness. I am a man of few words. Short adieux are best. God bless you, my friends—God bless you all.' His Majesty then descending the sloping avenue that led to the barge, with great activity jumped into it. Four gentlemen (two of them in riding dresses, with spurs on) laid hold of the rudder and clung to it. Three fell into the water and swam to the shore, among whom was Sir Richard Steele, of Kilmainham memory. Another, more persevering than the rest, stuck to the rudder until his Majesty, apprehensive for his safety, ordered him to be conveyed on board a barge in attendance, and thanked him for his zeal." His Majesty at last got on board, but had the mortification of being detained four days in the harbour, owing to contrary winds. Not till Friday was the squadron able to put to sea. The voyage, however, was to be most disastrous. His Majesty thus graphically tells the story of his sufferings and hair-breadth escapes to his confidant.

*The King to Sir W. Knighton.*

Dearest Friend,—I am sure that you will be quite surprised, after the long letter which I hope you received safe from me by this evening's post, dated from hence the day before yesterday, at receiving another from me, and also from the same place, but which I hope will be the last; for I have now determined, by whatever inconvenience it may be attended, upon proceeding directly by land for London, and we finally start at five o'clock to-morrow, and hope to be with you before four o'clock on Saturday at Carlton House.

There is no time for a florid description. We sailed again yesterday morning between four and five o'clock, with a most promising breeze in our favour, to make the Land's End. About two or three in the evening the wind shifted immediately in our teeth; a violent hurricane and tempest suddenly arose; the most dreadful possible of nights and of scenes ensued, the sea breaking everywhere over the ship. We lost the tiller, and the vessel was for some minutes down on her beam-ends; and nothing, I believe, but the undaunted presence of mind, perseverance, experience, and courage of Paget preserved us from a watery grave. The oldest and most experienced of our sailors were petrified and paralyzed: you may judge somewhat, then, of what was the state of most of the passengers: every one almost flew up in their shirts upon deck in terrors that are not to be described.

Most affectionately yours,

G. R.



*Royal George yacht,*  
Milford Haven, September 10, 1821.

My dear Friend,—So many unexpected circumstances have taken place since I wrote to you, that I scarce know where I am to take up matters to put you *au fait* of everything in all quarters. It is rather a difficult task to undertake, particularly as I know you are not partial to long letters. I will, however, endeavour to do my best, and be as concise as possible.

My last letter told you I was to embark (as I did) that day at Dunleary. We made since that two efforts to stand out on our homeward voyage, but were driven back by change of wind. However, on Friday last we stood out suddenly upon a change of wind in our favour, and persevered; but we encountered a most formidable tempest for nearly forty-eight hours, such as has been hardly known by the most veteran sailor, and, with the blessing of God, arrived safe in this port about eleven o'clock in the forenoon of yesterday. Not to be prolix, but in order to give you some little idea of our state, most of our fleet were separated, except the *Royal Sovereign* yacht, the *Liffey* frigate, and ourselves. The *Grecian* sloop of war, reckoned one of the best schooners in the service, sprung her mast, and was obliged entirely to part company from us in distress, and to make for the very first anchorage she could, where it is hoped she is long before this in safety, though as yet no intelligence of her has been received.

Most even of our crew and company were deadly sick, but the very worst of all was my poor self; and I am now for the first time, since we are again at anchor in smooth water, risen from my bed, and not without considerable exertion and inconvenience to myself. I have suffered so much solely for the purpose of writing to you; for I too gratefully feel the warmth of your affectionate heart towards me at all times, not only not to neglect you, but to prove to you that you are always present to my mind; and I felt quite sure, that if any part of our history of the last week should reach you, that the short note which Francis wrote you yesterday would not in the least answer the purpose of quieting your affectionate anxieties and cares about me. When Francis wrote, it was in the utmost haste to save the post, which leaves here before three in the afternoon, that you might know something decidedly of us, and we had then thoughts of pursuing our return overland, as he acquainted you; but, upon thorough consideration, we found this scheme next to impracticable, what from the very mountainous and bad state of the roads through this part of South Wales, the scarcity of horses, the dreadful length of the stages, and, after all, the formidable length of the journey itself to London, being above two hundred and seventy-two miles, and this, too, unattended with any sort of comfort or accommodation on the road, at any rate until we reached Gloucester. Upon the best calculation, therefore, we could not have reached our destination at earliest till Thursday night. We have

therefore determined, all matters considered, to summon up resignation and patience to our aid, to wait the first steady and favourable wind, and which is now very promising, that will carry us round the Land's End in about eight hours; after which we shall make Portsmouth at the very latest twelve hours afterwards, let the wind be then almost whatever it may.

In addition to this, I must also say that it was quite out of the question my being able, for two or three days at least, to encounter so tedious a journey by land; I am so completely shattered and torn to pieces by the effects and sickness of an eight-and-forty hours' tempest. Up to this moment, then, you are acquainted with everything upon which it is in my power to give you any information by letter. The veriest minutiae of the details of what has passed since we met, you shall have from me when we meet.

Now, then, God bless you!

Ever yours, &c.,

G. R.

The following is the diary of the voyage: "On the 8th, Saturday, the wind being unfavourable, the fleet could not proceed, and was obliged to lay to at sea during the night. On the 9th the squadron reached Milford Haven, at twelve o'clock. On the 11th the royal squadron sailed from Milford. The gale being strong and contrary, the fleet encountered many dangers incident to boisterous weather. On the 12th it returned to Milford Haven, and his Majesty, after suffering much fatigue during his protracted voyage, determined to land. Milford was illuminated on the 13th, at half-past five. The King landed and commenced his journey to London. He slept at the Priory, the seat of the Marquis of Camden, that night. On the 14th, at four a.m., he set out again on his journey, and breakfasted at Monmouth with the Duke of Beaufort. His Majesty slept that night at Chapel House, Oxfordshire. On the 15th his Majesty arrived at his palace in Pall Mall, at seven o'clock in the evening, attended by Lord Graves; after an absence of forty days, twenty-two of which he spent in Ireland."

Such was this eventful progress, the disappointment at the result being of course in proportion to the rapturous delight exhibited. The display was virtually insincere on both sides, the *épanchement de cœur* evoked being unwarranted. The wildest hopes were naturally excited, and a passage in his letter to the Lord Lieutenant, ambiguously expressed, seems to have been construed as a promise of immediate relief for the Catholics. "All classes and descriptions of his Irish subjects have made

the deepest impression on his mind, and he looks forward to the period when he shall re-visit them with the strongest feeling of satisfaction. His Majesty trusts that, in the meantime, not only the spirit of loyal union, which now so generally exists, will remain unabated and unimpaired, but that *every cause of irritation may be avoided and discountenanced*, mutual forbearance and goodwill observed and encouraged, and a security be thus afforded for the continuance of that concord amongst themselves, which is not less essential to his Majesty's happiness than to their own, and which it has been the chief object of his Majesty, during his residence in this country, to cherish and promote." This was no more than a benevolent desire for peace among the opposing factions. A great deal, however, was built on his studiously courteous reception of the Catholics, who were received in the closet, which caused consternation among many of the old "true blue" order. The impression made on the Duke of Montrose is worth recording. "It is not a little remarkable," he writes to Lord Eldon, "also, the command over themselves which the whole nation have had, from the highest to the lowest. At the theatre, though full of enthusiasm, they had a quietness and a desire to conduct themselves with propriety I never saw before. I have seen no drunkenness, no unregulated marks of affection and loyalty in the city; elsewhere, indeed, they have pressed upon the King to see and to touch him, a little inconveniently, and mixed perhaps with some superstition, as if some good would happen to them in some way or other from having touched the King or his clothes. The manner his Majesty has been received has had a great effect on his Majesty's feelings, and requires discretion not to hurry his Majesty into expressions which discretion may lament, or into comparisons more open perhaps than politic; also, perhaps, into grounds of expectation and hope which can hardly be realized." There was sound sense in these forecasts. Within a short time there was disgust on the one side at unfilled hope, and on the other a sense that his bourgeois familiarities and graciousness had been ill-repaid.

In his absence occurred the death of the unfortunate Queen, whose troubled career was no doubt hurried to a close owing to the recent mortification she had encountered. It had been almost settled that she was to undertake a sort of tour in Scotland, it may be presumed a counter-move to the Irish expedition of her consort. There was, Sir Henry Holland

says, a strange sort of irrational bravery in her nature, which made her disregard all common precautions, not merely as to public opinion, but even where personal risk was concerned. An acute internal inflammation had gone on for a couple of days without any attempt at checking it. She went, as we have seen, to the theatre; and it was on an accidental visit of her physician, Dr. Holland, that the first notice was taken of the malady. Bulletins were now regularly issued, but by the end of the week recovery was found to be hopeless. Her faithful friends gathered round her dying bed. Lord and Lady Hood—who, however, were quitting her service, the poor lady having selected a new favourite—the Rev. Mr. Wood, a son of the alderman's, Lady Anne Hamilton, Mr. Wilde, Dr. Lushington, and the two counsel, Brougham and Denman—the former quitting the sick-bed of his child to come to her. Mr. Denman describes what he saw with much true feeling. She lay on a sofa, a handkerchief round her head, her face flushed, her eyes bright, while she gave instructions for her will. From the first she had but little hope, and indeed was eager to quit the world that had been so troubled for her, and Lord Hood assured Mr. Denman that the speech reported in the newspapers was often on her lips: "I shall quit life without regret." She was constant and cheerful throughout, even heroic, without being theatrical. On the Tuesday she grew suddenly worse, and towards evening an access of fever coming on, mortification having set in, she with much vehemence of manner and excitement denounced the conspiracies and persecution that had attended her, but presently became calm. Seeing Dr. Holland beside her, she said with a smile, "Well, my dear Doctor, what do you think now?" She took leave of her friends, thanking them for their kindness, and in a not undignified fashion passed away about ten o'clock on the night of August 7, 1821. By her will and codicils what fortune she possessed was left to her *protégé* Austin, with remembrances to various friends and dependants. Some debts—indeed, £15,000 for her house—she commended to the care of the Government. She desired that she should be interred in Brunswick, and that the inscription, "Here lies Caroline of Brunswick, the injured Queen of England," be put on her coffin. If we can trust the profuse accounts of her conversations, one of her last acts was to declare her forgiveness of Dumont's calumnies. Mr. Wilde, afterwards Lord Chancellor, was with her to the last, and told Mr. Denman

that in her delirium the name of Bergami was never mentioned. It may be said that her death contrasted favourably with that of her husband, which was to take place nine years later.

The excitement and grief at Hammersmith during these events was prodigious—expresses passing and re-passing, the people crowding at the gates to learn the news. The whole kingdom was profoundly moved. Lord Castlereagh's blunt opinion was, that it was "to be regarded as the greatest of all possible deliverances for his Majesty and the country." But though this might be so, her interment was to bring his Majesty the most serious trouble and inconvenience, and by the unfortunate incidents connected with it, increase his unpopularity.

It was evident that the funeral would be seized on as an opportunity for a public demonstration, which the Government were naturally eager to check. They resolved therefore, while paying her the honours of a "lying in state," guards of honour, &c., that the body should not be taken through the City proper, but be brought round by devious and private ways. But the various partisans of the Queen, female as well as male, were determined that some capital should be yet made out of the display. A foolish correspondence was published between the Prime Minister and Lady Hood, the latter demanding that the funeral should be put off till she got her mourning ready—that there should be no guards, but the people should be trusted. On the day of the funeral—which was on the day week of her death—the unseemly proceedings began by a wrangle between the executors and the undertakers. Dr. Lushington made formal protest, urging the indecent haste shown, the forcing into the procession a guard. "Touch the body at your peril!" exclaimed the eminent counsel. "You will not use violence?" replied the undertaker, who also had to endure much abuse of the strongest from Mr. Wilde. Both he and the undertaker declared they would use force to carry out their views, but wiser councils prevailed, and the procession set out at about eight o'clock. It must be said that, under the circumstances, the affair was conducted handsomely. A hearse emblazoned with escutcheons and drawn by eight horses, heralds, twelve mourning coaches, and six squadrons of troopers, made a handsome show. But there was a deluge of rain, that never ceased. The arrangements—no doubt due to the mulish Lord Sidmouth—were from the starting-point carried out with a mixture of obstinacy and weakness that led to disastrous results. It had been determined



that at Kensington the procession should turn off the main road, ascending the steep Church Street, and so gain the Bayswater Road. But on arriving at this point, it was found that an enormous barricade of overturned waggons, &c., had been formed, which was literally impassable. The procession halted, while messengers were despatched for instructions to the Prime Minister. Towards eleven these arrived, with a Bow Street magistrate at the head of a troop of Life Guards, who decided that it was impossible to force the obstruction. Amid yells of triumph from the mob, the word was given to move on to the gate next to Knightsbridge Barracks, where it was proposed to cross the Park. Here it became evident that the passionate excitement of the mob would lead to mischief, for they clung to the gates and refused to let them be opened. Again the authorities had to yield, and the crowd, flying on before, were found to have formed a fresh obstruction at Park Lane, where the next passage upwards was to be attempted. The officers in command, as well as the magistrate, had received the most imperative instructions not to go through the City, and were determined, or rather were obliged, to carry them out at all costs. The only resource appeared to be to open the Park gates and make for the gate where the Marble Arch now stands. Thus foiled, the crowd made for the gate, which they closed, and threw up a barricade in the direction of the Edgware Road, along which the procession was to be taken. The railings were torn down and converted into pikes. The soldiers were attacked furiously with brickbats and stones, and, showing much good temper, were at last obliged to fire, killing two persons and wounding several others. On this the mob fell back sullenly, but, as will be seen, were not beaten. For his share in this transaction Sir Robert Wilson, having remonstrated with the officers in command in unbecoming language, was dismissed from the army. No doubt this was a severe step, but not more than was warranted by his behaviour. Even after the collision, Lord Liverpool, who directed all the proceedings, sent repeated instructions to the magistrate to carry out the original programme, which the military all through persisted could have been done, but after the bloodshed at the Park, those in charge did not wish to risk another collision. The reason they were so eager not to pass through the City, was the foolish idea that the body would be seized and detained there in consequence of the executor's protests against the "indecent haste"



exhibited. It is curious to find that they were also afraid the Lord Mayor would not admit the military.<sup>2</sup> The procession having made its way to Tottenham Court Road, had succeeded thus far in carrying out their programme—though indeed it was a strange funeral progress, marked at every step by violence, ill-will, stones, and bloodshed. Here was found another enormous barricade. Attempts were made to turn the obstacle, but the result was that the procession was driven down to Drury Lane, and presently forced to enter the City at Temple Bar. The people having thus gained the victory, the body was taken triumphantly through the City, being met by the Lord Mayor and authorities.

It took a couple of days to get to Harwich, where on the embarkation there was a fresh scene, unbecoming, though not of actual disturbance. At Colchester an altercation took place in the church as to screwing on the plate with the inscription, "Injured Queen of England," which the undertaker objected to, but which Dr. Lushington insisted on. The entrance into Harwich is described by the Queen's friends as offering a most degrading spectacle: "The undertaker leading on a lame horse, ten of his assistants following in pairs; a miserable spectacle, both as to cattle and dress: some with shoes, some with gaiters, some in spurs, others not." Unfortunately there is always something mean even in the most pretentious of these ceremonies—nothing is more degrading than the "behind the scenes" of these things. But it does not appear that the rites that attended the hapless Caroline to her grave were worse than others. The coffin was put on board a man-of-war, but it was then seen that another plate and inscription had been substituted. On the 24th of August it reached Brunswick, and was there interred with due state and ceremony at nightfall.

The whole obstructive attitude of the executors was unreasonable, and justified Lord Sidmouth in describing it as factious. Their particular grievance was the "indecent haste" with which within a week the obsequies were pressed on, and the mode in which the direction was assumed by Government. The case of the Government was unanswerable. The time, within three days, had been actually fixed by the Queen herself in her will. The Government were defraying all expenses, and the King, as her husband, had the undoubted right of making what arrangements he thought fit. Even all these were to be

<sup>2</sup> *Sidmouth's Life*, vol. iii. p. 360.

subservient to the public peace. That the charges of wishing to perform the ceremonies meanly, and of wishing to give her maimed rites, were unfounded, is shown by the order of the programme.

The Government was much troubled by these untoward events. It is amusing to find Lord Sidmouth, who was attending the King in Dublin, advising "that the tables should be turned, and we must become the accusers of the complainants, instead of suffering the complainants to be the accusers." Otherwise he is convinced "the Government will suffer severely in estimation and character." The police magistrate was dismissed. A contrast was the behaviour of Lord Liverpool, who wrote eagerly to Dublin to propose a general mourning, which he said would gracefully wind up the unhappy business. But the King would not agree to this. He was displeased too at the body not being embarked in the river, but the Admiralty had objected. Lord Liverpool again pressed that the mourning should be *general*, and pronounced three weeks too short; but the King declined to alter his resolution.

In this year he set off to visit Hanover. Sir W. Knighton attended his Majesty, and wrote to his own family reports of his progress. They got to Brussels on Thursday, the 28th of September. "The Duke of Wellington, Lords Londonderry and Clancarty, were in waiting to receive us. In about half an hour after our arrival, the King of the Netherlands, the Prince of Orange, and Prince Frederick paid their respects to his Majesty. We were all introduced. We then sat down to dinner, amounting to twenty-eight persons. I had one of my bad headaches; but I am now quite well. The truth is, I have so much to do, I am almost worked to death. Sir B. precedes us. My King, God bless him! never gives me a moment. The pen is never out of my hand by day, and it is his wish that I sleep in his dressing-room at night; so that he has access to me at all hours. You will not, therefore, be surprised that you do not get long letters from me."

On Monday, the 1st of October, he writes: "This has been a busy and an interesting day. Early this morning we quitted Brussels for this place. We reached the little village of Waterloo about twelve o'clock, accompanied by Prince Frederick of Holland, the Duke of Wellington, Lord Clancarty, and a number of persons of minor distinction. The King went into the little church of the village, examined all the tablets of

inscription upon the walls, then visited the willow tree under which was buried the shattered limb of Lord Anglesea, and seemed greatly impressed with all around him. The day was very unfavourable—it rained torrents; but, notwithstanding this, the King went to the plain of Waterloo, accompanied by the Duke, and examined every part of the various positions." This seems to have left a vivid impression on the King's mind. He often used to describe the ground and the battle, as it had been explained to him, and after libations of his favourite liqueurs, would delude himself that he had actively taken part in the operations of the glorious day.<sup>3</sup> At Dusseldorf "the whole garrison marched out by torchlight to serenade the King on his arrival. The effect was beautiful: I never heard such bands. The style in which they played 'God save the King' was enough to electrify one. I get but little sleep. I am, however, thanks be to the Almighty, quite well. You may judge what I have to do. Sir B. is at Hanover, or nearly so, by this time. Our suite consists of nearly forty horses, besides the escort; and all this moves without the slightest confusion. I have now two large Prussian grenadiers at my bedroom door."

On Saturday, the 6th of October, they were at Osnaburg, where he was received with great rejoicings, illuminations, reviews, and even tears. The Court Physician tells us it was some sixty years since the loyal Hanoverians had seen their King. On the 10th he made his grand entry into Hanover on horseback. Then followed levees and drawing-rooms. There were battues, and other festivities, a hasty coronation, but the natural result of these pleasures soon declared itself.

"Here I am, full of anxiety and wretchedness," writes the Court Physician on the 4th of October. "The King has got a most severe and uncomfortable fit of the gout. This attack commenced two days since. I still entertain hopes that I shall be so far able to get it under, that we may begin our journey on Thursday week. This will be two days later than I expected; but still I hope to save this by the route we intend to take. I have had an anxious time of it, I can assure you; but I do not regret it."

He soon got better, and Monday the 29th was able to set off for home. At Gottingen there was a tournament, and an

<sup>3</sup> On one occasion, boasting that he had led his own regiment down a great hill, he earnestly appealed to the Duke of Wellington as to his recollections of the feat. The reply was, "Very steep, your Majesty."

address from the University of so feeling a character that "the King burst into tears." At a civic ball, however, he was in great spirits, dancing a polonaise with the wife of Herr Von Schimmelpennick and waltzing with the burgomaster's daughters. Notwithstanding, Mr. Freemantle reported that his Majesty returned "bored with the Germans and disgusted with his Hanoverians, and that his fit of the gout was but a pretext to get rid of them."

It was noted that since his dangerous voyage from Ireland, his Majesty had shown signs of a new-born religious feeling. On his way to London from Milford after the storm, he had met Lord and Lady Harcourt. He got out of his carriage and sat with them, in theirs, on the public highway recounting all his perils at sea. The lady, as she told her friends, was quite edified at his pious acknowledgments of his escape, and there was quite a change to be noticed in his conduct. His physician, too, writing on the German expedition, notes various occasions on which Service was performed. It had been also noted that effusive declarations of the Irish voyage had often suggested themselves as requiring some fulfilment, and it was significant that Sir M. Tierney went about declaring that it was an injustice to the King that the claims of the Catholics should be refused. He was also out of humour with his Ministers as to baronetcies, and on his desire to make Lord Conyngham Master of the Horse, the Ministry objected, on which "a violent quarrel" took place.

The King, who had visited Ireland and Hanover, now felt that he must confer a similar honour on an important portion of his dominions. Indeed, the Scotch had already expressed some jealous dissatisfaction at the preference given to another portion of the kingdom, and the Sovereign—who was now, and not unnaturally, beginning to fancy himself "the idol of his people"—was eager to receive fresh instalments of the welcoming acclamations of his subjects. A visit to Edinburgh was therefore settled upon.

That nation, with a more wealthy middle class, and a more magnificent nobility, far exceeded the Irish in the splendour of their preparations for his reception. The whole kingdom became alive with preparations, for which some antique remnants of chivalric customs newly kindled by the enthusiasm of Walter Scott were admirably adapted, in the view of scenic effect. The preparations were of the most elaborate character—new roads

were made, old and ugly buildings thrown down, painting and decorations set on foot, while for the Lord Provost a magnificent equipage or coach, with six horses, was got ready—costumes and fancy uniforms, imaginatively accepted as connected with old days of chivalry, were devised—Celtic guards, &c.—while Sir Walter Scott wrote ballads to kindle the enthusiasm.<sup>4</sup>

His Majesty embarked at Gravesend on Saturday, August 10, 1822, amid tumultuous exclamations of joy and loyalty. The royal yachts, the Lord Mayor's barge, and a fleet of attendant boats, were all moored off the hospital, and formed a scene of extraordinary brilliancy and colour. The *Royal George* and the *Royal Sovereign* were to take him down the river, while a squadron of war vessels awaited him at the open sea.<sup>5</sup>

The King embarking, as was latterly his wont, with a benediction—"God bless you all!"—retired to his cabin to change his dress, and presently appeared on the deck in full naval uniform, and "wearing a cocked hat." His yacht was taken in

4 CARLE, NOW THE KING'S COME!

BY SIR WALTER SCOTT, BART.

*Being new Words to an auld Sprig.*

The news has flown frae mouth to mouth,  
The North for ance has bang'd the South;  
The de'il a Scotsman's die o' drouth,  
Carle, now the King's come!

CHORUS.

Carle, now the King's come!  
Carle, now the King's come!  
Thou shalt dance, and I will sing,  
Carle, now the King's come!

And so on for nearly forty stanzas.

<sup>5</sup> The modest accommodation of a royal yacht in those days offers a contrast to what is required now. "The quarter-deck of this royal yacht scarcely exceeded, in decoration, that of one of our crack frigates. The King's dining-cabin is a room about twenty-three feet wide and full seventeen feet deep. A door, opposite to that by which we had entered, conducted us through a passage about three feet and a half wide, and seven feet and a half long, to the King's state cabin, or drawing-room, which we supposed to be about twenty feet wide and fifteen or sixteen deep. To the left of the passage, entered by a door from the state cabin, was the King's bed-chamber, measuring about thirteen feet one way and the length of the passage the other. The ceiling was about six feet and a half from the deck, and the royal apartments, though richly and tastefully fitted up, did not appear to contain a single superfluous piece of furniture. In the two bookcases of the state cabin were several standard works. The *Royal George*, we understand, measures three hundred and thirty tons, and was built in 1817, at Deptford dockyard, from a design by Sir Henry Peake, one of the surveyors of the navy. The King's trip to Ireland last year, it seems, afforded indubitable proofs of the superiority of her construction. In the two days' gale which his Majesty experienced on his return, the yacht shipped scarcely any water; while the attendant frigates were 'plunging bows and bowsprits under.'"

tow by a steam tug, and he set off amid extraordinary excitement. Not till Wednesday did the vessels reach Leith.<sup>6</sup> As soon as it was descried, all Edinburgh poured out to line the hills and try and get a glimpse of the visitor, but the King determined not to land until the following morning. Visitors however arrived, among them Sir W. Scott, whom he greeted with, "The man in Scotland I most wished to see. Let him come up." As on the Irish visit, whiskey celebrated the arrival, and his Majesty called for some prime Glenlivet, in which he made Sir Walter pledge him.<sup>7</sup> The latter was the bearer of a badge or decoration, made to the order of the ladies of Edinburgh, and which he promised to wear. A bottle of wine was graciously thrown into another vessel, in which his Majesty's health was drunk: a guinea was offered for the empty bottle, and refused. Two noblemen begged to be allowed to keep the glasses which the King had handed to them.

Sir William Knighton gives this little account of the scene: "Yesterday was the day of our arrival. The weather continued wet, stormy, and uncomfortable during the whole night at Leith Roads: the yacht at anchor had an uncomfortable motion. I saw, for the first time, Walter Scott, who came on board immediately on our coming to anchor. He has no trace in his countenance of such superior genius and softness of mind as the beauty of his writings displays; but the moment he speaks, you discover a correctness of understanding and a display of intellect, marked by the utmost accuracy of thought. Speaking of the incessant rain, he said in his Scotch phraseology, 'All I can say is, I am perfectly ashamed of it.' The King then desired him to take a glass of cherry brandy, which he graciously handed to him himself. Walter Scott, when he had drunk it, craved a great favour from his Majesty, that he might be permitted to put the glass in his pocket to keep it as a relic, to his feelings above all value. The King's landing yesterday was most impressive and magnificent. By all accounts, more than a million of people had collected together on the occasion."

On the following day the King entered Edinburgh, being met by a magnificent procession, in which all the old offices of honour were represented, and to set off which picturesque, if

<sup>6</sup> One of the *avant couriers* was the inevitable Sir William Curtis, in his yacht, *Die jonge Vrouw Rebecca Maria*.

<sup>7</sup> The enthusiastic poet, who was in a sort of rapture the whole time, begged for the glass, and put it in his pocket; but on his return found his brother-poet, Crabbe, waiting, and in his excitement forgot the precious relic, and sat down upon it, crushing it to pieces.



fanciful, dresses were devised. The "Lord Lyon with a crown on, White Rod, Celtic guards, while his Majesty himself appeared in his admiral's uniform. He was heard to declare that the Scotch were a nation of gentlemen." At the close of the proceedings he arrived at Holyrood, where the old regalia of Scotland were offered by the "Knight Marischal;" then a pair of "barbed arrows" were offered on behalf of the "royal archers," who had dresses for the occasion. The day was finished at Dalkeith Palace, where the young Duke of Buccleuch—then about sixteen years old—received the King, who however brought his own cooks and household.

Then followed Levees and Drawing-rooms of extraordinary magnificence. His Majesty appeared in a suit of Stuart tartan, though he was not a little annoyed at the *gaucherie* of his admirer, Sir W. Curtis, who was arrayed in a suit of the same material and clan, and from his bulk seemed a sort of parody of his august patron. At the Drawing-room the King appeared as a field marshal. Then followed a performance at the theatre of *Rob Roy*, and a banquet, at which he was observed to partake of turtle and grouse soups, stewed carp, and venison, in the first course, and in the second, of grouse and apricot tart. He drank Moselle, champagne, and claret.

He made a characteristic speech, in the delivery of which "the voice of his Majesty was evidently affected by his feelings. There was a blandness in it, a pathos, which, more than even the words, spoke to the heart of every one present. Throughout his Majesty's utterance was most distinct; but, as he proceeded, there was an increase of energy; and, in concluding, he placed his hand upon his heart, and expressed himself with powerful emphasis." During the loyal songs, he not only beat time to the chorus, but "accompanied it with his voice." A more edifying spectacle was his visit to church of a Sunday morning. It was noted that "he lifted a psalm-book, and stood during the reading."<sup>8</sup>

\* "The spectacle of a monarch proceeding to humble himself in adoration before the King of Kings, could scarcely fail with a rational people to act as an example—as an incentive to devotion, rather than as the signal of clamorous rejoicing. When the royal carriage was near to the Cross, a few boys took off their hats, as if about to cheer his Majesty; but some old men dissuasively held up their hands, and the most prompt obedience was yielded to the signal. This circumstance was much noticed by the King, who turned round, seemingly pleased, and made some observation respecting it to his attendants. Indeed, we have reason to believe that there was no part of the behaviour of his Scottish subjects which was more admired by his Majesty than their conduct on this solemn occasion."

The music and dancing seemed to give him great enjoyment, which he signified by "looking up at the band and snapping his fingers." The celebrated Gow orchestra, which performed at Almack's, was here, and his Majesty used pleasantly to despatch his young host on errands to the *chef d'orchestre*, "with the benevolent view of disengaging him from the more arduous duties of the table. 'Come, Buccleuch,' said his Majesty, slapping him on the shoulder, 'you are the youngest man in the company, and must make yourself useful.' A glass of liqueur having been offered to the young Duke immediately after dinner, the King observed it, and said with a gracious smile, 'No! no! it is too strong for his Grace to drink.' After dinner his Majesty rose from his seat, and, advancing close to the band, graciously condescended to address Mr. Gow for the space of several minutes. Among other flattering remarks, he observed, 'From my earliest years I have always been fond of Scottish music, and have often listened to it with pleasure, but have never had so great a treat as this evening. I am happy to see the representative of Neil Gow in this place; and long may he live to delight his friends!' Gow was quite confounded with such a marked proof of the royal regard—his heart swelled, and his lips faltered; but, sensible that some acknowledgment was due, which, if not courteous, ought at least to be emphatic, he made an effort to ejaculate the words, 'God Almighty bless your Majesty!' which fell upon the royal ear in indistinct murmurs. When the King had withdrawn, Gow in some degree recovered his composure, and was heard to utter, 'I'm perfectly contented to die now!'"

On the 29th of August the King took his departure. His last words on quitting Dalkeith being "God bless you all!" He embarked at Queensferry.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> One of those fantastic exhibitions, which he always loved and encouraged, attended his departure. "In Ireland last year he was visited by a poor diminutive Irish cripple of the name of O'Brien, who came from the south coast, in a miniature cutter of his own constructing, not more than four feet in length, and in which (his legs and the greater part of his body being curiously stowed under the deck) he encountered rather a stormy sea in coasting along into Dublin Bay. He got safely alongside the royal yacht, however, and appeared in his tiny bark before his Majesty, who, pleased with the novel effort of the dwarfish and adventurous sailor, gave orders that ten sovereigns, with a plentiful supply of provisions, should be presented to him. The completion of this spirited expedition justly entitled the obscure navigator to preferment, and he was promoted by the sailors to the rank of Commodore, by which title he has been familiarly distinguished ever since. On the occasion of his Majesty's recent visit to Scotland, Commodore O'Brien deemed it proper to repeat his demonstrations of loyalty and attachment; and for this purpose he shipped himself, and

Departing from strict chronological order, we shall now describe another event.

The magnificent ceremonial of the coronation of George the Fourth is described by those who witnessed it as one of the most dazzling pageants that could be conceived. It was the last, and probably will remain the last, that was carried out on such a scale and with due attention to the old and chivalric theatrical elements of the ceremony. With such a monarch it was a show that was indeed after his own heart and his special tastes. In the preceding year a day had been fixed, and the "Court of Claims" had begun to sit, when tidings arrived of the Queen being on her way home. This disagreeable news threw all into confusion, and it was determined to put the ceremonial off. The following year it was determined to proceed afresh, even though the Queen was likely to give some trouble. The most costly preparations were set on foot. The "Court of Claims," to adjudge who were entitled to be present, again sat. Fancy dresses and jewels were ordered. Westminster Abbey and Westminster Hall rang to the sounds of workmen. The Queen sent in her demand to be crowned with the King, who referred her to the Privy Council, when the question was argued by her counsel. A curious array of precedents showed that most of the Queens had not been crowned with their husbands, and some not at all. The King therefore, having the discretion, declined to sanction her being crowned with him.

The eagerness to be present was extraordinary, which a dispute which arose between the Chamberlain and other high functionaries, as to who were entitled to give away seats in Westminster Hall, tended to increase. The whole area between the

found room for his cutter also, on board a sloop bound for Leith, where, unfortunately, he did not arrive till the evening preceding the royal embarkation from Port Edgar. Though late, however, he used every exertion to join the royal squadron; and next morning went off to his Majesty's yacht, where he was well known, and so kindly received and entertained that all the experience of the renowned circumnavigator became as nought, and his frail bark was no longer under the guidance of a prudent commander! After setting sail with the fleet, a gust of wind carried away his hat; in attempting to recover which, his crazy vessel upset and sunk, and it was with the utmost difficulty the Commodore was snatched from a watery grave! The irretrievable loss thus sustained by the Commodore having been made known to his Majesty, orders were given for the immediate building of a new cutter, in the royal naval arsenal at Leith, upon an enlarged scale and scantling, the keel of the new craft being no less than six feet in length! and the whole structure properly copper-fastened! Indeed, the hull is already nearly finished; and the Commodore is himself busily engaged in preparing the blocks (all ingeniously made of brass) for the various parts of the rigging, the whole of which is to be the work of his own hands!"

Abbey and the Hall was filled with grand stands and galleries. The Dean and Chapter farmed out the side aisle of the Abbey—as it was their privilege—to a speculator, to be fitted up with boxes, which he let at an enormous price. Special envoys came from all the courts. Every peer was given five tickets, all the great functionaries had a certain number, but the Chamberlain and High Steward had the distribution of three and four thousand a piece.

On the eve of the ceremonial the King came to stay at the Speaker's, while at one in the morning the guests began to arrive. At that hour, indeed, all the streets were crowded and blocked with carriages. Some slept in the stands: the Guards were under arms all the night. At ten o'clock his Majesty appeared, and a procession was formed in Westminster Hall. He entered at ten o'clock, wearing his magnificent robes, said to have cost £25,000. The King's herbwoman, attended by six maids, led the way. Dignitaries, lay and ecclesiastical, followed. English, Irish, and Scotch lords, bearing the standards of their respective countries. The Knights of the Bath, in blue and silver, succeeded; and it was noted that of all the brilliant figures Lord Londonderry, the only one who wore the full robes of the Garter, was the most striking and imposing. There was but one surviving nobleman who had walked at the coronation of George the Third—the Duke of Gordon—but he was too infirm to attend. The King was dreadfully exhausted, the heat adding to his fatigue, and it was thought would have fainted. The splendid scene that waited him at the Abbey restored him. The weight of his cloak, though the train was borne by seven supporters, added to his distress. Then the religious rites, of great length, began—the anointing, a sermon, the taking the Sacrament, when the Archbishop prayed that "*he might observe the commandments of God.*"<sup>10</sup>

In the evening followed the grand banquet in Westminster Hall, a more magnificent scene still. A sort of scene-painter's Gothic archway, with folding gates, had been erected at the bottom, through which the Duke of Wellington and Lord Anglesey and others rode in to do service. The excitement rose to its height when the well-known spectacle of the challenge was performed. Young Dymoke, the hereditary Champion, in

<sup>10</sup> When the King returned from St. Edward's Chapel, where some of the rites had taken place, he found the Abbey almost deserted by the tired peers and peeresses "but he moved about with great good humour," and spoke to those he knew.

full armour, rode in—his horse was furnished from a circus—and three different times flung down his gauntlet, while the challenge was proclaimed by a herald. The King drank to him from a gold cup, and he drank to the King, receiving the goblet "as his fee." He retired backwards.<sup>11</sup> It is a pity that this good old ceremonial has been abolished. It was related as a prodigy of culinary organization, that 240 tureens of soup, 7,000 lbs. of beef, 20,000 lbs. of mutton, &c., were served; but in our time the ordinary professional caterer would smile at such an insignificant call on his exertions.<sup>12</sup>

This great day thus passed over with infinite success for all concerned: save the unhappy Queen, who was persuaded to attempt the profitless venture of forcing herself on the ceremonies. At an early hour she set off in her coach and six, attended by Lord Hood, who, as we have seen, was to figure later in the King's interest. After having passed in a ticket, not her own, and been refused admittance at various entrances, the following scene took place on her first attempt. A number of soldiers drew across her path, and she was asked for her ticket. Lord Hood said, "Don't you know your Queen? She needs no ticket." The official said he had his orders, which were, to admit no one without a ticket. Lord Hood then produced his tickets, and the man said, according to the report, that she might enter upon that. She hesitated, and declined.<sup>13</sup> What would have occurred had she obtained admission—whether she would have advanced and taken her place beside her consort, on which some unseemly scene would have followed—it is difficult to forecast; but it was agreed by friends and enemies that it was an undignified and fruitless proceeding, as she attempted it, and that, if attempted at all, it should have been carried through with daring and resolution. As she retreated baffled, scornful jeers from the crowd—whose sympathies are forfeited by defeat or repulse—followed her.

From this time all her proceedings were marked with worse than the old recklessness. On that evening she wrote to the Duke of Norfolk, demanding in consequence "of the insult of that morning," to be crowned by herself within a week; as the

<sup>11</sup> The hero of a hundred fights had also to back his steed, which was found embarrassing to Lord Hood, whose horse was not well bitted.

<sup>12</sup> There were 100 dozen of champagne, 200 of claret, and port and sherry in fabulous quantities. Three thousand persons were entertained in adjoining rooms.

<sup>13</sup> This part of the story seems improbable, as it is likely the tickets were *personal* and not transferable.



preparations being ready, it would save expense to the nation! A few nights later, Denman went to see her, and found her with a large party, dancing, laughing, and romping, "but he saw that her spirits were frightfully overstrained." Indeed, her friends held that she had received her death-blow in that mortification. But this may be fairly doubted, as her nerves were not of such delicate texture.

Returned home from these various junkettings and celebrations, the King was now free to consider other schemes—and notably to cultivate his favourite passion for building. We may review the state of affairs to which his mania for re-building or altering his two palaces of Windsor and Buckingham House had brought him. The year before his death, the account stood thus—

	Original estimate.	Cost.	Excess.
Windsor Castle, building ...	£150,000 ...	£325,000 ...	£175,000.
State Apartments.....	(Unknown).		
Furniture, &c. ....	£150,000 ...	£167,000 ...	£17,000.
Lands .....	...	£58,000 ...	
Total.....	£300,000	£550,000	£250,000.

Thus here was an unwarranted debt of £250,000 incurred. We turn to Buckingham House, and find that the estimate was £270,000, the actual cost £482,000—an excess of £212,000—making nearly half a million together. But this was not all. The net revenue of the Woods and Forests, reaching a surplus of £70,000 a year, had been allotted to pay for the building as it went on; but it was found that this ready money had been seized on and devoted to other building purposes, leaving but a balance of £4,000 a year for the palaces.<sup>14</sup> How these unlawful plunderings were tolerated is inconceivable. An advance out of moneys owing by the French Government was then made equally unjustifiably—and amounting to £250,000. On the other hand, it must be mentioned that it was calculated that the rents of the new Carlton House Terrace would sell for

<sup>14</sup> It had been thus spent—

On account of York House .....	£57,000
Finishing Windsor .....	19,450
Ditto, New Carlton House .....	11,073
Ditto, Downing Street ..	3,017
Redemption of land tax, Carlton House.....	22,022
Alterations, St. James's Park .....	6,000
	£118,562



£70,000. Nash, his favourite architect, had been concerned in all his plans for the Pavilion and the new Regent quarter, Carlton. The Prime Minister declared firmly, that applying to Parliament for money was out of the question. He then proceeded to make a suggestion of an extraordinary kind, which was, "to sell or lease the site upon which St. James's Palace now stands," which however would not produce much, and even this proposal would be "received with particular jealousy by the House, and, if carried, it would be on the condition that the sum should be laid out under the control of the Treasury."<sup>15</sup> The result, however, was to raze, not St. James's Palace, but Carlton House, and to take Buckingham House in hand for restoration, or rather rebuilding. Accordingly, in 1825, it was handed over to the builders and architect, and at the King's death was left an unfinished pile. The King took his favourite mode of planning piecemeal and altering bit by bit, to which his favourite was obliged to adapt his plans and suggestions. It should, however, be stated, that the Duke of Montrose assured Lord Colchester that a calculation had been made of the repairs necessary for Carlton House and for those of Buckingham House, and that there was but little difference between them.

"Other alterations of an *architectural* sort are also proceeding in London," wrote Lord Colchester later. "The King's new palace, on the site of Buckingham House, is covered in; the Duke of York's, on the site of his former house, is sold in its unfinished state to Lord Stafford, for £80,000; and he gives £30,000 more to Lord Gower to finish it for his residence. Carlton House has nearly disappeared; and the new terrace of houses towards the Mall is rising rapidly; the grass part of St. James's Park is to be laid out in shrubberies like Regent's Park. New gateways, colonnaded, are already built at Hyde Park Corner, leading on one side into the King's garden by Constitution Hill, and on the other side by the Duke of Wellington's house, into Hyde Park. A new bridge of five arches has been thrown across the Serpentine, at the end nearest to Kensington Gardens; and a new carriage drive has been made round the whole of the Park north of the Serpentine, which makes a most desirable addition to the airing ground for carriages and equestrians."

<sup>15</sup> *Life of Lord Liverpool*, vol. v. p. 420. This proposal refers probably to the grounds round St. James's Palace gardens, &c., and does not, as Mr. Yonge thinks, imply that the palace was to be razed. The strict meaning, however, seems to convey that the palace was to be levelled.

To the Londoner few objects are more familiar than the Marble Arch, the Oxford Street entrance to the Park. This monument, suggested by his Majesty and copied from that of Constantine at Rome, stood within living memory in front of Buckingham Palace. It has no doubt puzzled the spectator what could have been the intention in erecting this rather bald and costly gateway; but it seems it was designed to commemorate the glories of his Majesty, much as the great French monarch erected *flamboyant* memorials of himself, *à la gloire de Louis XIV.*! On the summit was to have been an equestrian statue of the King by Chantrey; on each side bas reliefs recording Trafalgar and Waterloo. The Duke's bust was to have been displayed on the pedestal of the equestrian statue "between Europe and Asia," while on various other portions were to have been shown the King "approving the plan of the campaign," the King "rewarding the Duke of Wellington after Waterloo." Statues of the inferior officers were to have been disposed about the monument. The cost would have been enormous, and the King was prudent enough to set the plan aside.

Two enormous blocks of Carrara marble, which had been ordered by Napoleon for the purpose of making some commemoration of his victories, were presented to his Majesty by the Duke of Tuscany. It was determined to fashion out of them an enormous Waterloo Vase, twenty feet high, and the talents of Westmacott, the sculptor, were employed for the purpose; but the King required that his figure should be conspicuous among the group of victors.

One of the present treasures of the British Museum is the "King's Library," an admirably selected collection made by George the Third, worthy of a monarch of taste and reading. This his son presented to the nation by his son, but according to all accounts the gift was scarcely prompted by liberality. It is stated that he first proposed to offer it for sale, but his Ministry protested against this step. Some sagacious persons who heard the reigning favourite one day declare that "the Octagon Room," in which the books were kept, would make a fine reception-room for company, forecasted that they would be speedily disposed of. And so it proved. In January, 1823, the King wrote the following letter to Lord Liverpool—

Pavilion, Brighton, January 15, 1823.

Dear Lord Liverpool,—The King, my late revered and excellent father, having formed during a long series of years a most valuable and

extensive library, I have resolved to present this collection to the British nation.

Whilst I have the satisfaction by this means of advancing the literature of my country, I also feel that I am paying a just tribute to the memory of a parent, whose life was adorned with every public and private virtue.

I desire to add, that I have great pleasure, my lord, in making this communication through you.

Believe me, with great regard,

Your sincere friend,

G.R.

Another of the Regent's magnificent artistic ideas was collecting the portraits of all the Sovereigns who were represented at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle. This monument, for such it is, was a fitting decoration for a royal palace, and he was fortunate in selecting for the artist, Sir Thomas Lawrence. No less than thirty-eight portraits—all excepting five the work of this master—was the result.<sup>10</sup> He also formed a collection of Dutch and Flemish masters, for which school he had a great predilection.

<sup>10</sup> Two of them, those of Pope Pius and Cardinal Consalvi, Mrs. Jamieson considers not merely "the finest he ever painted, but the two grandest portraits of modern times, at least I know not any that in the combination of excellence, the noble conception, the felicitous arrangement, the truth of character, the gorgeous yet harmonious colour, can compare with them."

PERCY FITZGERALD.

## Creator and Creature.

---

### PART THE THIRD.

WHAT has been already said about the dominion of God is quite enough to justify the use of special terms in Scripture, for expressing His peculiar claim to the title of *Lord*. One such word is *Shaddai*, which, though it occurs no less than forty-eight times in the Old Testament, is applied always to the true God, never to false gods or to earthly potentates. Among the Greek translators, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, render the name by *ἰκανός*, "the self-sufficing," or, as we find elsewhere, *αὐτάρκης*; while the Septuagint sometimes gives the same rendering, and sometimes uses *ὁ κύριος*, or *παντοκράτωρ*, "the Almighty." This last word signalizes the attribute, which has taken the same prominent place in the English mind that *le bon Dieu* has in the French. The main Greek versions, then, alike combine to set conspicuously forth the import of a name; and that import is the Supreme Lordship of the One God.

III. A third character of the Divine Sovereignty remains yet to be examined. It is held to be to the praise of a human workman so to make a machine that, when he leaves it, it will hold together and do its office without his assisting presence. Falsely concluding that a perfection in one sphere must needs be a perfection in any other sphere, some have said, that God's dignity is best consulted by supposing Him capable of creating, and then of altogether retiring from His creation. The fact is just the opposite. In the ever active Divine Omnipresence, and in its needfulness, the inalienable, essential dominion of God is most magnificently shown forth. Thus the absolute dependence of creatures is most effectively declared. And the truth in this matter is so elementary, so fundamental, that it was one of the capital doctrines of Christianity enumerated by St. Paul in his statement before the Areopagites.

To that scene, so glorified in painting and poetry, but still more in the living men who have drawn thence lessons of highest wisdom, it will now be well for us to recur. The Council of the Areopagus had the duty of watching over the

introduction of new religions ; and thither, accordingly, the Apostle had to go to get leave for preaching Jesus Christ, Whom, moreover, he contrived to preach in the very asking of permission. "Whilst Paul waited at Athens, his spirit was stirred within him, seeing the city wholly given to idolatry. He disputed, therefore, in the synagogue with the Jews, and with them that served God, and in the market-place every day with them that were there. And certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics disputed with him, and some said : What is it that this word-sower would say? But others : He seemeth to be a setter-forth of new gods ; because he preached to them Jesus and the Resurrection. And taking him they brought him to Areopagus, saying : May we know what this new doctrine is, which thou speakest of? For thou bringest in certain new things to our ears. We would know, therefore, what these things mean."<sup>1</sup>

It might have made a bold man despair to enter upon such a pleading before such an audience. But St. Paul was strong in the faith of the Resurrection, and had himself been favoured, later on, and "as one born out of due time," with a vision of the risen Redeemer. Moreover, he had conversed with the eye-witnesses of Christ's wonderful career, and himself had been, not only a spectator, but an agent in the miracles which marked the first spread of Christianity. All these sources of encouragement he needed on the present occasion ; for he was to speak to an ill-prepared body of hearers. In old Pagan Greece the priests, indeed, had a religious tradition which they handed on ; and Lange may be right in his contention against Zellen, that "among the Greeks there was an obstinate orthodoxy, which rested as well on the interests of a haughty priesthood as on the belief of a crowd in need of help." Still the priests developed no reasoned-out theology ; the philosophers, rather than the priests, were to the people their scientific theologians, dogmatic and moral. The Greek priests had no catechism in the school, no pulpit in the temple. Now philosophy had been going on mostly from bad to worse. For the last three centuries Stoicism, Epicureanism, and Scepticism had been the prevailing systems ; and the Acts expressly mention the two first as encountering St. Paul. All three in religious matters sought to satisfy the cravings of the poor, hungry, human soul ; their common quest was *ἀρπαξία*, rest, peace, in some form or other. Stoicism and Epicureanism aimed at

<sup>1</sup> Acts xvii. 16--21

this end by propounding positively a doctrine; Scepticism by renouncing certainty of knowledge and acquiescing in the defeat of long baffled effort.

Una salus victis nullam sperare salutem.

Yet one sect did not shut out all hope for the future; hence they were especially *σκεπτικοί*, men on the look out, who *as yet* had found nothing sure. We may suppose St. Paul to have had among his auditors representatives of each of the three classes mentioned. The day had long gone by when the assembly of the Areopagus could even pretend to be strict in its definition or condemnation of irreligion. In past times its sentence had fallen upon, or threatened, some of the best remembered names of Athens; Socrates, Protagoras, and Aristotle, Æschylus, and Euripides, were among the number. But now the judges themselves were too conscious of living in glass houses to indulge freely in stone-throwing. We may fancy we see in their ranks the Stoic, a materialist, a pantheist, a fatalist;<sup>2</sup> identifying God with an all-pervading force or form, that can find reality for itself only by actuating the passive element of the universe; acknowledging one God or many gods, according as the whole of Cosmos or the parts come into consideration; holding as his one law of morals *ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν*—life in accordance with nature. Next to him sits the Epicurean, as far as this world is concerned a believer in atoms and void, and in the fortuitous concurrence of the former, aided by a spontaneous swerve out of the straight line of their downward fall; whilst, as to gods, he holds that they, in number many, live apart, doing nothing, happy in the contemplation of their own excellence, affecting man neither for good nor for ill, though a human worship of them is defensible, if paid in pure acknowledgment of really existent perfections, without hope or fear of any result. Third comes the Sceptic, who allows service of the gods to go on in the temples, provided the worshippers commit themselves to nothing dogmatic in the practice; there must be no leaning either to affirmation or denial, no declared theism and no declared atheism. There must be no over-seriousness of belief; perhaps a sense of humour in the position is the most suitable attitude; for sterner earnestness may beget tenacity of opinion, or be a sign of its presence.

These we may imagine to have been three marked types

<sup>2</sup> Some exception may be taken to each of these epithets, but predominantly their application is right. Moreover, not all members of the same school had exactly the same tenets.



among the Areopagites ; but of the infinite blendings of views and no views it would be idle to attempt an account.

Before such an assembly as this did the great Apostle of the Gentiles appear to proclaim the dogmas which all, at least by inner secret necessity, yearned to know. He told them the truth, if haply they might recognize it. Had their desire of understanding been more earnest, more pure, more what it ought to have been, it would not have been without its fulfilment. But, then, for the most part those men were idly inquisitive, as was Herod when he availed himself of Christ's presence simply to make experiments in the interests of curiosity. The inspired writer with meaning puts in the parenthesis : "All the Athenians and strangers that were there, employed themselves in nothing else, but either in telling or in hearing some new thing." No wonder that, in the preaching of Christ's Gospel, they had ears that were deaf to what was the special part of the message. They failed to catch the truth for identically the same cause which holds back many now-a-days, who call themselves inquirers and will culpably remain in that class till the end comes, and their time for inquiry is over, and Another will turn inquirer, and put a question which they will not be able to answer satisfactorily either to Him or to themselves.

Not all, however, failed to profit by St. Paul's words ; "but certain men adhering to him did believe, among whom was also Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them."<sup>3</sup> Be our lot with those who listened rightly and rightly understood. "Paul standing in the midst of the Areopagus said : I perceive that in all things you are too superstitious. For passing by and seeing your idols, I found an altar also on which was written, *To the unknown God*. What, therefore, you worship without knowing it, that I preach to you, God Who made the world and all things therein." Here is the correction of one error in Greek philosophy. Plato had got far enough to recognize God as the world's Artificer ; yet not as immediately such, but only mediately through a ministering spirit. Aristotle gave to God a final, or teleological causality upon the world, but not an efficient causality. No one of the philosophers seems to have consistently taught the doctrine of genuine creation. St. Paul supplies the want, and proceeds : "He, being Lord of Heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples

<sup>3</sup> V. 34.

made with hands [so as to be confined within walls]. Neither is He served with men's hands, as though He had need of anything, seeing it is He Who gives to all life and breath and all things. . . . He is not far from each one of His : For in Him we live, move, and have our being." God is not identified with Nature, as Zeno said, nor wholly aloof from it, as Epicurus said. He is present everywhere, and His omnipresence is not inactive as, rightly or wrongly, we may imagine that of the all-pervading ether to be, when it is in what we call the state of rest. Without substantial union, without any commingling of natures, God is in all things, preserving them in being. For, as St. Paul puts it in the Epistle to the Hebrews, God "carries," "supports," "upholds everything by the word of His power," in such sort that a collapse, not merely into fragments, but into blank nothingness, would be the result of His ceasing to act. Annihilation, if ever it take place, is not, and cannot be, a positive action ; it is mere discontinuance of action on the part of the All-Supporter. This doctrine is only a corollary of the proposition which declares God to be the Creator of all things, creation implying conservation. Nor was the explicit statement of the truth reserved for the New Testament. Already in the Old Testament<sup>4</sup> the sacred writer, to prove that God knows the heart's most secret thoughts, appeals to this fact : "The Spirit of the Lord hath filled the whole world ;" and this same Spirit it is that "containeth all things," holding them together not merely as parts of a whole, but so as to keep in being the ultimate component elements themselves. For, as the same writer says in a subsequent chapter,<sup>5</sup> "How could *anything* endure if Thou wouldst not, or be preserved if not called by Thee?" What the containing vessel is to water, what the force of cohesion is to a diamond, what the vivifying principle is to the living organism, that is God, after His own manner, to everything : and He is more. For not only does He surround all as an inclosing surface ; not only does He permeate all as a binding power or as a life-giving principle ; but each created being, in its full extent, so depends on Him that there is no part which is independent. And in this sense He is "all in all."

It must further be remarked, to forestall difficulties, that the omnipresence of God is without contamination to Himself, as also without labour, wearisomeness, or molestation of any sort. And thus, by no example that falls under our senses, can it be paralleled. It is unique, as Divine attributes must ever be.

<sup>4</sup> Wisdom i.

<sup>5</sup> C. xi.

Closely connected with Divine conservation is Divine concurrence. No matter that the schools diverge in their attempt at further explanation of the latter point. The *how* they may dispute, but the *fact* all must admit. It is sufficiently intimated in St. Paul's declaration that such intimate acts as are breathing, and life-processes, take place, *as acts*, under God's immediate assistance: "He gives to all life and breath and everything." Not a movement, not a vital function, that is not from Him as immediately as from ourselves, though under a different causal denomination. "In Him we live and move," and our life and motion are His acts, as coming from their primary efficient cause, our acts as coming from their secondary efficient cause, and ours likewise as immanent in their formally living, moving subject.

Of course a teaching like this must not be so set forth as to make God the moral author of sin. If any systems really incur this charge—a point on which nothing must be decided rashly—the fault is in the systems, and not in the revealed doctrine, which they fail rightly to develop. The solution of difficulties may be briefly indicated by saying that God wants to give man freedom, and is not to be balked of His purpose because human freedom naturally entails power to choose wrong, side by side with the power to choose right. God commands the good choice, and specially aids—not compels—its accomplishment; while the bad choice He condemns, but will not withdraw from it His purely physical concurrence. Many other orders of Providence were possible; but looking only to the one *de facto* adopted, we are struck at the scope given to created liberty. Most men who are serving God are serving Him not only with full power, but with strong allurements to throw off that service. In this way God has, I will not say under all respects, but under one respect, a greater glory than He would get from a creation where virtue was easier and the virtuous more numerous. It is a noble tribute to the sovereignty of our Master, it is a proof of generous fidelity, to serve Him in spite of varied, violent, and continuous temptations. Grace is powerful, but it does not ordinarily take from virtue its arduousness. Moreover, called as we are to a supernatural end, the stakes are very high, and God has a right to make the play proportionately difficult—proportionately a strain on the energy of free choice; which it could not be were God bound to stop each tendency to wrong election by refusing concurrence. Had we been left to our natural destiny, our difficulties might have

been less; and of the alternative results, the one certainly would have been less blissful, and the other possibly might have been somewhat less wretched. As it is Heaven and Hell are respectively very sweet and very bitter; and the struggle between them is very great.

After these few remarks in explanation of a difficulty, the present paper may fitly draw to its close by citing, in its favour, the witness of the Fathers. But it is right first to premise that, in speaking of conservation or of concurrence, the Fathers sometimes do not explicitly teach the doctrine we want from them, but are more immediately talking about the maintenance of cohesion in bodies, or about the providential guidance of events. Moreover, they sometimes require a *special* Divine action, where, according to modern physics, *ordinary* forces are capable of preserving their own harmonious disposition. Still, with full allowance for whatever can be discounted on these several claims, the Patristic argument is abundantly able to satisfy all its obligations.

To begin with the Greek Fathers.<sup>6</sup> St. Justin says, "Of His own will God created that which before was not; and now He continues it in existence by an act equivalent to production." Here we have conservation put on a par with creation. Next is the witness of Maximus of Tyre: "What thing is there which would endure, if God did not uphold its nature?" The inmost essence, therefore, must be reached by the Divine action; it is not enough that some direct extrinsic aid be supplied. Commenting on St. Paul's words, *Upholding all by the word of His power*, St. Chrysostom explains them to mean, "governing all and keeping together what else would fall away. For conservation is not less than creation," a repetition of what we have before heard from St. Justin. "His is providence," again writes St. Chrysostom, "His conservation, His the power to act, His the fact of existence without perishing." Once more: "Do not suppose the Son to be a mere Minister of the Father: for He is said to conserve all, and this is not less than to create all." St. Cyril of Alexandria adds his weight to the scale: "Things created out of nothing cannot otherwise be preserved than by God, without Whom they at once lapse into their own natural condition, that is, nothingness." Finally, St. John

<sup>6</sup> It is convenient to class under the Greek Fathers all who wrote in Greek. By so doing, however, we split up the Syrian school, which used Syriac at Edessa and Nisibis, Greek at Antioch. St. Ephrem represents the former division, while the latter is represented by St. John Chrysostom.

Damascene thus puts the coping-stone to what has been built upon the Greek Fathers: "Without commixture God permeates all things, giving to each its power to act in conformity with its capacity. . . . The distance of all things from God is one, not of place, but of nature. . . . God is in all things. For from *Him Who is* depend all other existences, and nothing can be, if its being is not in *Him Who is*. . . . God upholds all things as conserving their nature." To God belongs τὸ περιέχειν καὶ συνέχειν τὰ σύμπαντα. The passages above quoted would not prove our case unless their meaning went beyond any such indirect conservation or concurrence as one creature can give to another. But beyond this point they certainly do go. They certainly teach that inner, essential, utter dependence of all created things, both statically and dynamically, both in perduring existence and in passing action, upon God, the Universal Upholder and Cooperator.

From the Latin Fathers it is easy to draw a companion picture to that taken from the Greek. St. Augustine alone furnishes passages that, in number and clearness, and in evident authority, would suffice to establish the truth under discussion. "Every creature," says he, "has the cause of its being in the almighty, all-sustaining power of God. Were this power once withdrawn from created objects, straightway they would perish, and all nature would fall asunder. The case is not as with man, who, having built a house, goes his way, and in his absence the work abides. The world could not stand a moment if God's ruling hand were withdrawn." Nothing could be more explicit than such a statement. Even the very point of disparity between the abiding of God's work and the abiding of so much of any work as can be attributed to man is brought out in express terms. Another passage is to the same effect: "Were God to take away what I may call His builder-power from things, they would become as thoroughly non-existent as they were before they were made." In the Confessions occurs this pithy little sentence: *Non fecit atque abiit: sed ex illo in illo sunt*—"He did not do and depart: but His work is so from Him as to abide in Him." Secondly, we have St. Gregory's authority: "God is in all, beyond all, above all, below all. He is above by His power; below all as sustaining all; beyond all by His immensity; within all by His subtlety. . . . Nor is it one part of Him that is above, another below; one without, another within; but one and the same Being, in His entirety, is everywhere."



Lactantius supplies the following: "Take away God's providence and power, and then nature is simply nothing." Linking on the Fathers to the scholastic Doctors, St. Anselm thus explains those words of Colossians i. : *Omnia in ipso constant*—"In Him all things consist: for as He created all, so He holds together and rules all. In Him all things consist, because, by reason of the immensity of His boundless divinity, all are within Him, and by Him they are kept back from returning to nothingness."<sup>7</sup>

Thus we have before us the complement to the doctrine of creation. Were God's gifts to us from Him only as first Producer, we should owe Him more than what we owe to the men who make things and give them to us. But our obligations are heightened when we come to see how God is ever in His gifts, supporting their existence, and working with them in all their effects. Without fear of pantheism, we may regard ourselves as simply bathed in God's omnipresence; for God actively permeates all His creatures. Because of the divinity therein, the ground on which we tread is holy, and so are the air we breathe, the food and drink we take; so too are our bodies and souls, except so far as we choose to defile them; and so especially is the grace that sanctifies us. Reverence, surely, is the lesson here taught us. To be sensitively, keenly reverent, in the order of natural virtue, is partly a matter of temperament and of that exquisite delicacy of perception which comes of high culture. Blasphemy in the mouth of a half-brutalized drudge, whose whole bringing-up has had nothing humanizing in it, may be common to him as every-day speech; whereas a well-bred gentleman would avoid such language simply from ingrained repugnance to what is coarse; for he hates vulgarity in all its shapes. But essential reverence to God is no mere department of good manners. It may be found in poor people, whose manners are very rough, and whose natural sensibilities are very dull; though, of course, these characteristics are, in themselves, impediments. That man is substantially reverent who habitually lives in God's sight, and, because of the divinity that is within him and all around him, tries always, not only to avoid offence, but to do what is well-pleasing. Such a one lives by faith—lively, operative faith, which will end in beatific vision and in the presence which is "face to face."

JOHN RICKABY.

<sup>7</sup> See Suarez, *Metaph.* disp. xxi. xxii.; Petav, *De Deo*, lib. viii. cap. ii.; A Lapide, *in Act xvii. Coloss. i.*



## *Louvois and the French Army.*

### PART THE FIRST.

It was the good fortune of Louis the Fourteenth, surnamed the Great, to be surrounded throughout his exceptionally long and brilliant reign by men eminent in every department of Church and State, to whose genius, much more probably than to any very extraordinary ability or remarkable performances of his own, he owes the high-sounding title his countrymen have thought proper to bestow upon him. Certainly, few kings have been better served than the sovereign who, in addition to the military genius of a Turenne, the engineering skill of a Vauban, and the capacity for finance of a Colbert, could command the indomitable energy, passion for reforms, and talent for organization of a Louvois. But whilst of all the illustrious Frenchmen who by their various achievements in the arts of peace and war have added to the glories of their country, few, if any, have rendered more important services than the man who, like Carnot in more recent times, "organized victory" by his reforms in the French army, there is perhaps no one whose claims to distinction were till quite lately so little known to the generality even of his own countrymen as those of François-Michel Le Tellier, Marquis de Louvois. It is not easy to account for the comparative obscurity of a great historical name such as this, for the history of the man is the history, military and political, of thirty of the most stirring years in the reign of Louis the Fourteenth. Perhaps the great variety, number, and magnitude of the events themselves, comprised within the long period during which Louvois held office, together with the greater prominence of his master's figure—a master always jealous of any reputation at all likely to obscure his own—may have helped to throw into the shade the memory of the great Minister who did much in the quiet solitude of his cabinet to shape those very events to the greater glory of his Sovereign. The reputation of Louvois is, moreover, unfortunate in having

suffered positive as well as negative loss; for whereas the good services he unquestionably did his country have been lost sight of or forgotten, the record of his misdeeds has survived and come down to our own times in all its original freshness.

To the generality of readers the name of Louvois is synonymous with interminable wars, successive devastations of the Palatinate, and ruthless persecution of the French Protestants. For his wise reforms in the French army, his intelligent encouragement of the arts and sciences, and the impetus he gave to the manufactures and trade of his country, he gets little or no credit. In this country particularly he is best known as the Minister who brought about the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, and carried it into execution with unspeakable barbarity. We have no justification to offer for the selfish war-policy which for more than thirty years filled Europe with bloodshed, nor have we the least intention of attempting to clear the memory of Louvois from the infamy he has brought upon himself by his share—and it was a very notable share—in the cruelties consequent upon the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. A man who, to gratify his insatiable lust of power, kept all authority in his own hands, and who was ready to adopt at a moment's notice any policy which he thought would make him indispensable to the King, has only his own ambition to thank if posterity, endorsing the verdict of his contemporaries, throws the entire guilt of these shameful transactions upon him, and holds him responsible for crimes which in many cases were committed without his knowledge or contrary to his known wishes and positive orders.

But, after all, though it would be impossible, even if it were desirable, to bury in oblivion all the evil which has outlived the man, it is quite feasible to dig out much of the good which lies buried with his bones. The result of such an attempt would be, we think, to show that there is a very bright as well as a very dark side to the public life of Louvois, and that if his policy was a detestable policy of aggressive wars, he turned to right good account his undeniably great administrative ability, particularly in the matter of military reforms. These reforms take up a no inconsiderable portion of an elaborate history of Louvois' administration, military and political, written within the last twenty years by M. Camille Rousset, of the French Academy, from original documents in the archives of the *Dépôt de la Guerre*, to which we are indebted for the facts we are

about to lay before our readers. It may not be uninteresting to state by the way that the *Dépôt de la Guerre* and the *Hôtel des Invalides* were both founded by Louvois, and entitle him to the respect and gratitude of his countrymen. We might further add, in proof of Louvois' amazing activity in the public service, that his correspondence fills no fewer than nine hundred folio volumes.

Louvois was born in the winter of 1641. He began his political career at twenty, when, through the influence of his father—Minister of War under Richelieu and Mazarin—he obtained the reversion of the Secretaryship of War. He closed his life by a sudden death in the summer of 1691. His first start in life he owed to his father's influence—all the rest to himself; and for thirty years, that is, up to the hour of his premature death, he continued to be the confidential adviser and right-hand man of his Sovereign, with all the power, though without the title, of First Minister of the Crown. The service of such a master as Louis the Fourteenth, the most egotistic despot that ever ruled over France, with the single exception of the first Napoleon, must have been very uphill work. There is more of irony than was probably intended in the opening words of his panegyric, "God alone is great," spoken by Massillon over the body of a man who had claimed for himself the monopoly of greatness, and who, starting at the very shadow of independence in others, had looked with an eye of jealousy and suspicion on every species of merit or genius or power which had not been called into existence by himself, or at least received some kind of sanction at his hands. The famous axiom, *L'état c'est moi*, expressed a principle of absolutism to which everything and everybody in Church and State was accommodated. Ministers of State and Marshals of France, learned ecclesiastics and men of letters, scions of the nobility and members of the Royal Family itself, had value in the King's eyes just in so far as the lustre of their services or great names served to advance or set off his own grandeur in the sight of France and of the world. Nobility of birth, presumably because hereditary rank entails a proportionate amount of independence, was an unpardonable offence if it did not consent to serve the King in the army, or dance attendance upon him at Court; and because the weight of additional honours might have threatened the glories of majesty itself with partial eclipse, the members of the Royal Family often experienced great

difficulty in obtaining some few of the prizes which were lavished on the King's bastards. To the Grande Noblesse, therefore, Louis for the most part preferred persons of obscure origin for the great offices of State, and delighted in bringing to the front such men as Colbert, the son of a tradesman of Rheims, or Louvois, who did not care to trace his pedigree further back than his grandfather—for the simple reason that such men being more absolutely beings of his own creation, were thought less likely to assert their independence or murmur too loudly if the credit of their achievements was appropriated by their maker and master. If this is a correct judgment of Louis—and, however severe, it is the judgment pronounced upon him by such of his contemporaries as had the courage to speak their minds—it is difficult to understand how any one who prized his dignity and self-respect as a man, could be induced to enter his service. Louvois was not required to make his election; he was already in power when, at the close of his minority, Louis the Fourteenth took the reins of Government into his own hands, and, in spite of the King's jealousy and in the teeth of much opposition from the nobility, little pleased to see *un homme nouveau*, as they contemptuously styled the energetic Minister of War, he kept his place and held his own for thirty long years with a degree of tact and temper we should hardly have expected from a man so imperious and impatient of control as Louvois is said to have been.

But successful as he was, he did not succeed in escaping altogether the effects of Louis' inevitable jealousy of a great name; for the envy which had only been sleeping during the lifetime of Louvois was roused up into a perfect storm of resentment by the great increase of his reputation after death. Incredible as it may seem, it is strictly true that Louis displayed his gratitude for the services of his indefatigable servant, by venting his impotent spite on the dead bones of the great Minister, which he ordered to be removed from their resting-place at the Hôtel des Invalides to a humbler place of sepulture, for no other assignable reason than that the man's posthumous popularity was hateful to him. Not a little of Louvois' success in life, whatever his fate after death, must be attributed to the precept and example of his father and immediate predecessor at the French War Office, and to the training he received from him. Le Tellier's experience of the character of Louis was invaluable to his son, and the prudent reserve which guided

the relations of the former with the monarch was part of the stock-in-trade with which the young Louvois started on his career. This cautious demeanour, by lulling the King's suspicious temper as to the designs of the father, predisposed Louis to encourage the more soaring ambition and unquestionably greater ability of the son. Louvois bettered an instruction, the worldly wisdom of which his own experience must have confirmed, and left the King to sun himself to his heart's content in a blaze of light, while he himself was content to toil for the public service in the cold of the background and the shade. But if he was so far indebted to the example of his father, he owed all the rest of his long prosperity to his own ambition, backed by the skill, energy, and success with which, in order to retain the power he had gained, he laboured, we fear we must add, at almost any sacrifice of principle and honour, to render his services indispensable to the King. This was his indemnification for the secondary rôle he was constrained to play, and the revenge he took on the egotism of Louis.

It was not, after all, difficult for a clever and unscrupulous Minister to make himself master of the situation, provided only, whilst working for his own ends, he kept up an assiduous appearance of supporting with all his might the King's ridiculous pretensions to sole and absolute sovereignty. Those, therefore, of his Ministers who had studied the character of the King—and no one understood him better than Louvois—took good care to foster the delusion, with which Louis flattered himself, that he not only reigned over but really governed his kingdom. Outwardly pliant and subservient, and compelled to submit every measure, great and small, to the King's approval, his Ministers never dreamed of directly withholding anything from his knowledge. But when some pet scheme was to be carried through, for which there was reason to fear opposition from Louis, they had recourse to stratagem. In these circumstances it was their practice, when they came before the King at the daily audience, with their piles of papers and bundles of despatches, to overwhelm the poor man's well-known craze for detail and real love of hard work with a most bewildering multiplicity of comparatively unimportant matters, until his mind, quite wearied out, was no longer able to give the necessary attention to the more important business they had purposely kept to the last. When the farce was over and he had regained his own apartments, how hugely must a man, with Louvois' sense of humour,

have chuckled with the double satisfaction of having got his own way and befooled the man whom he had just left rejoicing that never was king less ruled by his Ministers—the truth being, if we are to believe Saint-Simon, that if ever Sovereign, outwardly so absolute and independent, was completely under the thumb of his Minister, Louis was that Sovereign and Louvois that Minister. “Il est donc mort,” writes Madame de Sévigné on receiving the news of his death—“ce grand ministre, cet homme si considérable, dont le *moi* était si étendu.” Yes, his *moi*, as our Transatlantic cousins would put it, was a bigger *moi* than even his King’s; for Louvois’ *moi*, tarnished, it is true, by many a discreditable deed, has nevertheless the ring of true metal about it; Louis’ *moi*, though outwardly very brilliant, gives out only the dull hollow sound of counterfeit coin.

So much for the man in general; now for his work in particular. The work most inseparably connected with the name of Louvois is, as we have already hinted, the reform, it might perhaps not be too much to say the creation of the French army. The policy of Louis the Fourteenth, a policy of endless war, required three things for its success—allies, money, and soldiers. De Lionne found the allies, Colbert raised the money, and Louvois made the soldiers. The army was not kept long in suspense about the intentions of Louis and his energetic Minister in its regard. Their first act after the King’s accession to power was the suppression of three great military commands, those, namely, of Commander-in-Chief of Infantry, Commander-in-Chief of Cavalry, and Grand Master of Artillery. The Office of Grand Constable of France had already been abolished by Richelieu. The next move was to place the supreme command of the army, hitherto shared more or less equally by the three great officers just named, in the hands of one man, that man being, of course, the King. Thus was at last realized the dream of Richelieu and Mazarin. Both of these great Ministers, Mazarin in particular, whom certain unpleasant experiences of the Fronde had made as fearful of the Turennes who set him up, as of the Condés who overthrew him, had longed for the change it was reserved for the energy of Louvois to effect. Thenceforth the army had but one master instead of three. With the abolition of the office of Colonel-in-Chief of Infantry disappeared the highest as well as most powerful post till then known in the French army. So far, at



least, as the infantry was concerned, every rank and grade in it depended for its existence on the Colonel-in-Chief, who was not only the virtual Commander-in-Chief of the whole army, but also the recognized head of every regiment, the first company in each regiment being known as that of the Colonel-in-Chief. So real and substantial were the privileges of this office that the King took good care, whilst abolishing the office itself, to retain its privileges for his own use and benefit. From that moment all infantry officers, from colonel to ensign, were to be named, or at least approved, by the King, and all commissions to be drawn up and signed by the Secretary of War. The splendid services of Turenne, and the great name of the Duc de Mazarin, who happened to fill respectively the other two great military offices we have mentioned, saved them for a time from all but complete extinction, and they continued to drag on an enfeebled existence for a few years more, their essential rights and privileges suffering gradual but constant diminution from the steady encroachments of Louvois, until they ceased to be anything more than mere honorary distinctions. The abolition of these offices was a beginning of reform, and a step in the right direction, since the concentration of all military power in the hands of a single individual, whatever its drawbacks on other grounds, gave to the army a principle of unity and cohesion hitherto deplorably wanting. But it was nothing more than a beginning. There was little organization and less discipline in the army, and as for abuses of every kind, their name was legion. To remedy these evils, as far as the circumstances of the times would permit, was the heavy task to which Louvois devoted his best energies from the outset of his career. The reform of the army became the labour of his life; but it was also a labour of love, and after thirty years of incessant struggles and indomitable perseverance, he had the satisfaction, before he died, of seeing his efforts crowned with the complete success they deserved.

The first wars of the reign of Louis the Fourteenth had opened Louvois' eyes to the defects of a military system which, with all its faults, was nevertheless reckoned at the time the best in Europe. But the patriotism and ambition of Louvois were not of a nature to rest satisfied with only a relative superiority. He resolved to make the French army absolutely the most efficient in the world. On succeeding his father at the War Office in 1662, he found it in as deplorable a condition in

every respect, as anything with the name of army could well be. Indeed, the name was about all there was of it. Only a very small number of corps had anything like a fixed establishment or regular existence. Order and discipline there were none. The King had very little authority over it, the Secretary of War still less; even that of its generals, unless established by exceptional firmness of character or by distinguished service in the field, was rendered nugatory by the open defiance or covert resistance of their subordinates. The distinction of ranks and grades, when not in a state of hopeless confusion, was totally disregarded, the endless quarrels and rivalries of the aristocracy of the day being the cause of as much disorder in this respect as was ever the outcome of the most turbulent democracy. The causes of all this lawlessness were manifold, but what lay at the root of the evil was the gross venality which pervaded the entire military system.

The army was by no means the exclusive property either of the King or of the State; it belonged piecemeal to its various officers, who had become possessed of their respective shares, some by free gift, others by right of purchase. In those days the ownership of a regiment, of a company of infantry, or of a squadron of cavalry, was quite as real, if not always as remunerative, as the possession of a flock of sheep or a crop of wheat. Whenever the needs or the policy of the Government required an augmentation of force in the army, warrants were issued gratis by the Secretary of State for the raising of new regiments and companies. These warrants entitled their possessors to the ownership of the regiment or company so raised. Having raised their regiments or companies, the colonels and captains proceeded to dispose of the inferior commissions just as they pleased; they gave them away if they were generous and open-handed, or sold them if they were poor and needy, the latter method being by far the most common contingency. Not that this kind of traffic had the countenance of law; on the contrary, it was strictly forbidden by the regulations. But these regulations were as much a dead letter as the particular regulation which required the further sanction of the King, or at least that of the colonels-in-chief, for the exercise of those military functions the distribution of which had been left to the colonels of regiments and captains of companies. License in this respect had run to such a height that the officers most nearly concerned hardly ever took the pains to ascertain if their

commissions were drawn up in regular form, or indeed, if they had commissions of any kind. With them possession was nine-tenths of the law, and so they gave themselves no further trouble. Writing to Louvois on the 5th of January, 1665, Coligny complains in these terms: "I find," he says, "that all the older commanders are destitute of supplies, either because they have lost theirs, or because, not being sharply looked after, they have taken no pains to procure any, being quite content to trust to the word of their regimental officers, while these last have been disposing of offices and commissions wholesale without saying 'by your leave' to a soul." It is not certain even, whether or not when a colonel wished to get rid of his regiment, or a captain to throw up his company, he invariably waited for the King's permission or the consent of the Colonel-in-Chief; anyhow he would most assuredly have been very much surprised, and not a little annoyed, if his choice of a successor had been called in question. Here then was a market for the open sale and purchase of military commissions—a market, too, in which the value of this novel species of merchandize, quite as subject to the alternations of rise and fall as the price of bread or butcher's meat, went up with rumours of war, and fell again on the ratification of peace. For peace was the signal for a general disbanding of the army, or at any rate for a great reduction in its strength. Only a very inconsiderable number of corps were retained on a war footing, as a sort of apology for a standing army; all the rest were either entirely disbanded, or else so reduced in strength as to be practically valueless to their owners.

Moreover, the original warrants to raise troops having been issued gratuitously by Government, and the after sale of commissions being strictly speaking illegal, those who happened to find themselves losers by the transaction had no real claim upon the State for indemnification. Hence the officers, ruined by peace, had nothing for it but to indemnify themselves as best they might, and this they did to some purpose. Naturally such a system as this, besides encouraging an aggressive and war-like policy on the part of the Government, exposed the public exchequer to endless robbery. Thus, what at first sight had the appearance of a wise economy, namely, the partial reduction or total disbanding of the army in time of peace, so far from securing the interests of the State, proved in the end as costly as the wildest extravagance, by opening the door to fresh frauds

on the national purse and to jobbery of a most disgraceful nature.

The officers of the army did not wait till ruin came upon them to begin their fraudulent operations. They had a keen eye to future contingencies, and took their precautions accordingly. They stuck at nothing. There was no roguery so shameful, no injustice so cruel which they did not practise to avert the danger of bankruptcy, which would be the too probable result of the disbanding or reducing of their regiments. To say nothing of the wholesale pillage and extortion, which they meted out with a most liberal and singularly impartial hand to friend and foe alike, they found a ready expedient, and, as they perhaps thought, a sufficient excuse for their malpractices in another defect of the military system. The modern Frenchman may at times feel disposed to contrast unfavourably the heaviness of his war budget in the nineteenth century with the comparative lightness of a war budget in the seventeenth. But such a comparison is deceptive, because based on false grounds. The estimates of to-day, enormous as they are, include the total expenditure on the army, and the French nation therefore knows to a sou what it is in for; the estimate of the seventeenth century included only a portion, and by no means the most considerable portion of the entire cost, viz., the daily pay of the officers and men. Thus all that came out of the public coffers was the soldiers' daily pay, miserably insufficient as it was, and but very irregularly paid; the rest of the expenses of the army had to be borne by the officers themselves, whose business it was to clothe, feed, equip, and arm their men, to purchase horses, and procure supplies of every kind. No wonder if, under these circumstances, the State found itself obliged tacitly to allow the claim advanced by the officers to the all but absolute ownership of their respective corps, or if the officers sought to compensate themselves by every means, fair and foul, for the enormous expense they were put to. When once he had placed the men's pay in the hands of their officers, the King was content for the rest with the exercise of a very vague, general, and perfunctory supervision of the army, through the agency of certain men, a cross between the civilian and the soldier, known as Commissioners of War. These officials were, in the great majority of cases, in direct collusion with the officers they were sent to superintend; or if anxious to do their duty conscientiously, they were too timid to act, especially as they had

little or no hope that such action would be backed up, or that their persons would be protected by the higher authorities against the anger and violence of defaulters.

As a natural consequence jobbing, swindling, and robbery were the order of the day. It was quite a common occurrence for an officer, when tired of the dull monotony of life in a garrison town, to take himself off without any sort of leave of absence to Paris, and there to dissipate in gambling and debauchery the sums he had received from Government for the pay of his men. In the meantime the wretched private, thus shamefully defrauded of his scanty pay, was driven by dire want, no less than by the example of his superiors, to the commission of every kind of excess. Clumsily armed, badly clothed, and worse fed, he had no alternative but plunder or desertion, no choice but to die of hunger or by hanging. This was the condition and behaviour of officers and men even in 1668. Writing to Louvois on the 14th of February, the Marquis de Rochefort informs him that there is a marked diminution of sickness in the infantry, but adds, that the convalescent are slow to recover strength, and alleges as the reason, that their coats and shirts are rotting on their backs. The Duke of Luxemburg had just as little reason to be satisfied with the men under his command. In a letter to Louvois, dated May 28, 1668, he ends his complaints in these terms: "If there were only a few"—he is speaking of the negligent conduct of officers—"who made themselves notorious by their misconduct, we might proceed against them; but there is disorder in every corps, and the evil is all but general. There is scarcely a cavalry or infantry officer who does not give his men the run of the country, and allow them to go where they ought never to be. I have made it known that we mean to bring these officers to book, and that I shall send you word that the men who permit these excesses are the very worst in the King's service. We have had some of them shot; we shall hang some more to-morrow; but all this severity will never put a stop to the wildest license it has ever been my fate to witness." The man who penned these lines must have seen a good deal in his day, and yet this is his language, when Louvois had already been some six or seven years at work on the much-needed reformation of the army. The disorder was, indeed, too universal for such partial measures as the shooting or hanging of a few of the delinquents.

If even the poor private's purse was cruelly emptied to



minister to the amusements of monsieur his officer, need we be surprised to find that the Royal Exchequer fared no better? In truth it was robbed most systematically and thoroughly. Foremost amongst the barefaced frauds practised by the officers for the purpose of filling their purses at the expense of Government was a form of deception known as the fagot trick (*industrie des passe-volants*). These *passe-volants*, or fagots, were men hired or impressed to fill up temporarily the gaps in the ranks of a regiment or company with a view to hiding their real deficiency in strength from the eye of the Government inspector. Officers' servants, camp-followers, and idlers of no occupation, were quite good enough for the purpose. Accordingly on the occasion of the official visit from the King's Commissioner of War, of which visit there was generally plenty of notice, these varlets had a sword or musket thrust into their hands—they were not particular as to their attire, a recognized uniform in the French army being as yet a thing of the future—and thus hastily furnished forth they paraded solemnly before the royal officer. How the rogues contrived to keep their countenance, we are not told. Sometimes when the interval of time between the review of one corps and that of another was not so short as to require for the success of the trick that a man should be in two places at once, the officers of one regiment would oblige their brothers of another with the loan of as many of their own soldiers as they themselves could muster together; and just as in amateur theatricals, when it comes to the battle-scene, a handful of supernumeraries by passing repeatedly across the stage will often be made to represent a whole army, so these *passe-volants* might, under favourable circumstances, be paraded half-a-dozen times and be made to do duty for as many different regiments in a day; the net result being that the officers were commended and rewarded in inverse proportion to the efficiency of the force under their command, and that they pocketed of the public money exactly the difference between the number of names on the muster-roll and the real strength of their regiments. This monstrous fraud was helped out and made less liable to detection by the practice of designating the privates not by their own but by counterfeit names, with a marked family likeness, and by the absence of all Government control over the recruiting, which was entirely in the hands of the officers. 'It seems to me,' the Duke of Luxemburg writes to Louvois,



in October, 1675, "that we ought to make a direct attack on the captains of regiments for the effrontery with which they parade their companies in such strength on pay-day and in such diminished force in the field."

Abuses such as these, which in time of peace might have amounted to nothing worse than a wanton waste of the public money, became a very serious danger in time of war. A fatal consequence of the malpractices we have been describing was the alarming discrepancy between the returns sent up to headquarters and the number of men actually present in the field ; so that at the outbreak of hostilities a general, credited we will suppose with a force of ten thousand men, often made the disagreeable discovery that he had scarcely half that number to begin the campaign with. The missing men were accounted for by the sick-list, from which after the first engagement of any importance their names were in due course promoted to that of the killed or wounded. From the systematic practice of accounting for every deficiency, from whatever cause, in the normal strength of the regiments, under the one simple heading of casualties of war, the returns sent in to a general after a battle often showed an amazing disproportion between his own losses and those of the enemy. Hence the most inefficient corps, as they had the appearance of having suffered the most, not unfrequently stood highest in popular esteem. Thus the country, generally unfamiliar with these disgraceful transactions, was completely deceived, and a most flagrant injustice was done to the really deserving. For as the amount of glory to be reaped on the battle-field is commonly measured by the greater or less loss suffered in the struggle, it came to pass that the highest reputations were made, not by those regiments which as a matter of fact had suffered the greatest losses, but by those which though they appeared to have been the most roughly handled had in reality suffered the least, the gaps already existing in their ranks having left little or no scope for the blows of the enemy. As with the honour, so with the rewards. The most comfortable quarters and the least irksome garrison duties were reserved for the men who had thus acquired a great reputation under false pretences ; the officers even received large sums from the treasury to indemnify them for losses never incurred. A remarkable encouragement this, for the brave fellows who had really borne the brunt of the battle, and for those loyal officers, who instead of seeking to fill their own

pockets at the expense of the Government, or to earn an unmerited reputation for gallantry in the field, had discharged their duty faithfully to the State by keeping their regiments up to the full strength and efficiency required by the regulations, but who in recompense of their uprightness were left out in the cold when the time for the distribution of honours and rewards came round!

These monstrous abuses, and numberless others scarcely less serious, had for years been patent to all but those who wilfully closed their eyes. What is the reason, then, that no statesman before the time of Louvois had had wit or pluck enough to grapple with the evil? Why in particular had Le Tellier, Louvois' father and predecessor at the War Office, done little or nothing to stem the torrent of corruption? Before he became Secretary of State, when filling only the post of War Commissioner in Piedmont, he had for a long time been an eye-witness and had acquired ample experience of all the disorders rampant in the army; and yet he had only temporized, or at best had combatted the evil without spirit. Le Tellier was by no means destitute of combativeness, especially when his own interests were at stake, but he was above all a politician and a cautious one, whose chief anxiety it was to keep the balance even between the rival parties in the State, to give as little offence, and raise up as few enemies against himself as possible. Moreover, in his dealings with the army he took his cue from his friend and patron Cardinal Mazarin, whom he knew to be at least indifferent to, if not in secret connivance with, much of the roguery that went on. The great solicitude of the latter was, as we have said, not so much that his officers should have clean hands, as that they should be unable to lift them against himself. The Cardinal's policy, therefore, and consequently that of Le Tellier, was principally concerned with depriving the generals of the power of initiative by limiting as much as possible their authority. Thus, what with the self-interest of some and the indifference or incapacity of others, the evil had been allowed to grow till it was nearly incurable, and the reform a work of all but insurmountable difficulty. Other statesmen may at times have attempted in a half-hearted way to take the difficulty in flank, but if so, they had failed: Louvois alone had the resolution to face it, and he succeeded. The story of his efforts and of his success our limited space obliges us to defer to a future number.

*A History of our own Times.*

IT used to be said, and with some justice, that a great part of the English nation was more ignorant of the history of England than of that of Rome and Greece, and that those who were acquainted with the history of their own country, stopped short in their knowledge somewhere in the century before that in which they lived. It stands to reason that, under ordinary circumstances, histories are not written till the immediate actors in the scenes which they relate are passed away, till the passions of the political or social conflict have cooled down, and till the secret springs of action are to some extent laid bare by the publication of memoirs and correspondences which cannot be given to the world until after a certain lapse of time. We have, for good or for evil, changed all that. We have biographies of men not yet dead, written with considerable industry, if not with considerable impartiality. Royalty has led the way in the revelation of domestic secrets, and it is inevitable that, if panegyrics of distinguished men may be published while their widows and children are yet alive, the same anticipation of the functions of the historian will be allowed to writers who are not panegyrists. The curiosity of the public, the easy prizes of successful though ephemeral literature, and the craving for notoriety which belongs to an age like our own, all combine to tempt the historian to begin his work too soon. It may be said that he is himself the chief sufferer, if his work flashes up for a few weeks and then dies away into speedy oblivion. But it is not quite certain that many of the writers of whom we speak care for more than an ephemeral success and its tangible reward. The true question is whether the public mind is likely to gain or to lose by these so-called histories, whether they will contribute to its sound information, or only aggravate its shallowness.

Certainly not all things can be well told immediately after they have happened. No great historian is likely to be found in the crowd of writers of the day. But it may be fairly said, on the

other hand, that nothing can be much worse than to leave the general public to be guided as to the history of their own times by the newspapers, and that, even if the writer, in a particular case, is not able to do all that we could wish, he may, if he is honest and painstaking as well as judicious, confer a great benefit on a generation, by connecting their own immediate present with the immediate past. In times when every one has a duty to public affairs, when the countries which are in the most hopeless state of all in Europe are just those in which large classes are excluded—or exclude themselves—from all participation in the management of the government and the policy of the state, it is very well that popular history should be at hand to enlarge the view and bring together various kinds of necessary information. Even the looking through the cartoons of *Mr. Punch* for a series of years is some kind of a help to the formation of a judgment on the present leaders of parties, and the parties themselves, as well as on questions which concern more than the interests of parties. Up to a late time, any one who wished to get up the history of the past few years was driven to choose between the *Annual Register* and the *Annuaire* of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. When the last invasion of Afghanistan was ventured on, few people were well enough up in the history of our former dealings with the Afghans, to be able to anticipate how that history would repeat itself. Such achievements as the Chinese war of Sir John Bowring, the mutilation of Sir Alexander Burnes' despatches, or, again, such facts as those which can only be hinted at in connection with the system of transportation, are not without their value to any member of the governing classes, in a country like England, and yet they are easily forgotten, if only on account of their very blackness. We conclude that histories of our own times are very useful in their way, if only we can find the right men to compose them.

The admirers of Mr. Justin M'Carthy will say at once that in him we have the right man. He has certainly produced four large and brilliant volumes, and he has gone over the space of time which he set himself to traverse. He could not set himself more, for his last volume ends with the general election of 1880, and the consequent downfall of Lord Beaconsfield. A reader well acquainted with the men and acts of the time will find in these pages sound and kindly judgments and accurate statements of general facts. He will be able to supply from memory

much that Mr. M'Carthy does not seem to think it worth his while to record. He will recognize the men—Palmerston, Gladstone, Bright, Disraeli, the two Derbys, Russell, and, to speak of the earlier volumes, Peel, Aberdeen, and the rest. Mr. M'Carthy shows to very great advantage in his appreciations of the characters and powers of our leading public men. If he has a fault, it is that he underrates the men on his own side, and overrates considerably the leaders on the other side. He is never a partisan, though he lets us see whether he approves or disapproves, and his estimate of the English character in general is on the whole as just as that of prominent Englishmen. The passages which will be most often quoted in reviews and comments on the book will be some of these descriptions of character. He has hit off very well the illogical dulness to patent facts, when they are not actually under his nose, which gives to the ordinary Englishman his reputation of being practical. He has done justice to the wisdom of those who have sometimes guided the counsels of the country, venturing on what is for its true interest as well as for the interests of justice, sometimes at the cost of their own popularity. And, although the great fault of the book is a certain sketchiness, this is often more apparent than real. At least the reader, who knows where to look for it, will often find a series of facts which he had thought were forgotten, mentioned and at least epitomized in a place to which it has been transferred for reasons of brevity. The style is not always equal to itself, or to its subject. There is but too often a strain after antithesis or some other danger of the kind; allusions to popular literature, to plays and novels of all kinds and ages, are too often made to do duty for historical reflections, and, if they are sometimes smart, are more generally tiresome and out of place. What have Lady Teazle and Joseph Surface to do with our dealings with Shah Shoojah? The language of the book is sometimes a little slipshod, and resembles that of a man who has written leading articles—though, as to this, we are entirely in the dark as to the fact in Mr. M'Carthy's case. On the whole, the work before us has many qualities which belong to the permanent history, though we must doubt whether it will attain that character. Its defects as a book of reference are very great. No doubt it is a mistake into which many writers fall, to overload their pages with notes and references. We have a great respect for the old school of historians, who hid their



laborious exertions under the guise of a flowing narrative, leaving their readers to trust them or not for the authorities of their facts. But it is possible to err in either direction, and Mr. M'Carthy's pages are notable for their complete want of notes, authorities, and other condescensions to the usual requirements of a book of history in the nineteenth century in England. Nor does he help us even by an analytical table of contents, or copious headings to his chapters. The ordinary reader will be inclined to think him less accurate and trustworthy than we believe him to be, and the book's chance of longevity is seriously impaired. We feel sometimes inclined to do with Mr. M'Carthy what he quotes Sydney Smith as doing with regard to Lord Melbourne—denounce his apparent negligence as an imposture, and “accuse him of honesty and diligence,” which he certainly does not parade. We may add that the literary summaries in the work are by no means good of their kind.

Before proceeding to notice one or two points in this new history which appear to us worthy of special comment, let us give the reader a good long specimen of Mr. M'Carthy at his best, and use the extract to justify the remarks which have already been made on the style of the writer. Here is a passage from the chapter in which he sketches the dealings with the Eastern question of the cabinet of Mr. Disraeli.

A change soon came over the spirit of the administration. It began to be seen more and more clearly that Mr. Disraeli had not come into office merely to consider the claims of agricultural tenants and to pass measures for the pulling down of what Mr. Cross, the Home Secretary, called “rookeries” in the back slums of great cities. The Prime Minister was well known to cherish loftier ambitions. He was not supposed to have any warm personal interest in prosaic measures of domestic legislation. If a great Reform Bill were brought forward, he could fight against it first, and adopt it and enlarge it afterwards. If any question of picturesque theology were under discussion, he was the man to sustain religion with epigram, and array himself on the side of the angels in panoply of paradox. But his inclinations were all for the broader and more brilliant fields of foreign politics. The poetic young notary in Richter's story was found with his eyes among the stars and his soul in the blue ether. Mr. Disraeli's eyes were among the stars of imperialist ambition; his soul was in the blue ether of high policy. Since his early years he had not travelled. He had hardly ever left England even for a few days. He knew personally next to nothing of any foreign country. Perhaps for this very reason foreign affairs had all the more magical fascination for him. The prosaic dulness



of Downing Street may have sent his fancy straying over the regions of Alexander's conquests; the shortness of the walks between the Treasury and the House of Commons may have filled him with dreams of far-extended frontiers and a new Empire of the East.

The marked contrast between the political attitudes and tastes of Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Gladstone came in to influence still further the difference between the policy of the new Government and that of its predecessor. Mr. Gladstone delighted in the actual work and business of administration. As Dr. Johnson could grapple with whole libraries, so Mr. Gladstone could grapple with whole budgets. He could assimilate almost in a moment vast masses of figures which other men would have found bewildering even to look at. He could get into his mind almost in a flash all the details of the most intricate piece of legislation. During the long, involved, and complicated discussions of the Irish Church Bill and the Irish Land Bill, he had conducted the controversy chiefly himself, and argued the legal details of perplexed clauses with lawyers like Cairns, and Ball, and Butt. He could indeed do anything but rest. Now Mr. Disraeli had neither taste nor aptitude for the details of administration. He could not construct a complicated measure, nor could he even argue it clause by clause when other men had constructed it for him and explained it to him. He enjoyed administration on the large scale; he loved political debate; he liked to make a great speech. But when he was not engaged in his favourite work he preferred doing nothing. It was natural therefore that Mr. Gladstone's administration should be one of practical work; that it should introduce Bills to deal with perplexed and complicated grievances; that it should take good care to keep the finances of the country in good condition. Mr. Disraeli had no personal interest in such things. He loved to feed his mind on gorgeous imperial fancies. It pleased him to think that England was, what he would persist in calling her, an Asiatic power, and that he was administering the affairs of a great Oriental Empire. He was fond of legislation on a vague and liberal scale; legislation which gave opportunity for swelling praise and exalted rhetoric. It was not without justice that his opponents constantly insisted that he was not an Englishman, but a foreigner, a descendant of an Oriental race. There was, indeed, something singularly narrow and ungenerous in the constant taunts thrown out against Mr. Disraeli on the score of his Jewish ancestry. Every one who was at all within the limits of the actual political world knew that these taunts came from Mr. Disraeli's political supporters as well as from his political opponents. Every discontented Conservative was ready to whisper something about his chief's Jewish descent. But although there was an inexcusable want of generosity in thus making Mr. Disraeli's extraction and ancestral faith a source of objection, it must be owned that as a matter of historical fact his foreign extraction has had a very distinct influence on his political tendencies and his ministerial career. Mr. Disraeli had never until now had an opportunity of

showing what his own style of statesmanship would be. He had always been in office only, but not in power. Now he had for the first time a strong majority behind him. He could do as he liked. He had the full confidence of the sovereign. His party were now wholly devoted to him. They could not but know that it was he whose patience and sagacity had kept them together, and had organized victory for them. They began to regard him as infallible. A great many on the other side admired him as much as they disliked his policy, and believed in his profound sagacity as devoutly as any of his most humble followers. He had come to occupy in the eyes of Englishmen of all parties something of the position once accorded to Napoleon the Third by the public opinion of Europe. Even those who detested still feared; men believed in his power none the less because they had no faith in his policy. That Mr. Disraeli could not be mistaken in anything began to be the right sort of thing to say. He was therefore now in a position to indulge freely in his own personal predilections with regard to the ways of governing England. In the House of Commons he had no longer any rival in debate. Mr. Gladstone had withdrawn from the active business of politics; Mr. Bright was not strong enough in physical health to care much for controversy; there was no one else who could by any possibility be regarded as a proper adversary for Mr. Disraeli. The new Prime Minister, therefore, had everything his own way. He soon showed what sort of statesmanship he liked best. He soon turned away from the dusty and plodding paths of domestic legislation. He ceased even to pretend to have any interest in such a common-place and homely work. He showed that he was resolved to play on a vaster stage, and to seek the applauses of a more cosmopolitan audience. Napoleon invited Talma to Erfurth, that he might play to a pitfull of kings. Mr. Disraeli was evidently determined to play to an audience of kings and emperors.

Now this is very brilliant, and a great deal of it is true. The Imperialism which for the moment became fashionable and popular in the country was no doubt in great measure the offspring of the peculiar mental conformation of the man who had risen in so wonderful a way to supreme power. Mr. McCarthy does not consider Mr. Disraeli as at all wanting in ability and even genius of a certain kind. Indeed, as we think, he considerably overrates him—for he seems to place him, in the "class list" of statesmen, higher than Lord Palmerston or Lord Russell. He does not deny him the credit due to his industrious and patient perseverance in organizing and guiding the party which never perfectly liked him till the period of his last reign. His acknowledgment of the almost unparalleled influence which the subject of his com-

ments exercised during the duration of his ministry, shows how truly he estimates the English people,—a changeable and many-headed monster, as clumsy and inconsistent and full of prejudices and of self-conceit as the Athenian democracy itself which has been sketched for us by Thucydides and Aristophanes. There is nothing ill-natured in this description of the idol of a few years, but there are many touches in this passage which are unworthy of a true historian. The first paragraph is full of strain after effect. What will posterity make of the allusion to the speech at Oxford in which Mr. Disraeli declared himself "on the side of the angels?" What is the force of the image of the poetic young notary with his eyes in the stars and his soul in the blue ether? It is very true, again, that Mr. Disraeli knew nothing about foreign politics. But he may well have thought it a good plan for an English Minister to do what he once charged Lord Palmerston with doing—to divert public attention from domestic questions to the theatre of the East, and to seek for popularity by what the present Lord Derby, we think, once called the "gunpowder and glory business," without being inspired by the dulness of Downing Street with a longing for the regions of Alexander's conquests. And certainly Lord Beaconsfield might have waited for ever for his dreams of a new empire in the East, if they had been dependent on the distance between the Treasury and the House of Commons. This is simply poor writing,—as poor as many things in *Lothair* or *Endymion*.

But, as we have said, the passage contains a great deal of good sense. Mr. M'Carthy has put his finger on the weaknesses of both the prominent political leaders of our time, the excessive activity of Mr. Gladstone, and the deep ignorance of Lord Beaconsfield. It is also quite true, as he says, that the attacks on the latter came quite as much from his own side as from his political opponents. Nor has there often been a supremacy like that enjoyed by Lord Beaconsfield during the greater part of his last administration. To other Ministers, the secession of men so considerable as Lord Derby and Lord Carnarvon would have made a great difference. It made none to Lord Beaconsfield; at least, if it made any, the effect was not seen till the crash of the Conservative party, nearly a year ago. Again, few men on his own side had shown more insubordination and less contentment with his leading than Lord Salisbury, who, for a long time after the Conference at Constantinople,

was looked upon as more nearly one in opinion with Mr. Gladstone as to Eastern affairs than with his own chief. But Lord Beaconsfield managed to tame the high spirit of the descendant of Cecil, and latterly he had no more faithful and thorough follower than Lord Salisbury, who had once, or rather not once, denounced him in language not often heard in Parliamentary circles. But then again, the stroke about Talma and his audience at Erfurth is overdone. And so is another passage about the Elizabethan revival. At the outside, that nonsense was talked by one or two people—if we remember rightly, chiefly by Lord Salisbury himself, the last public man in England who ought to have used such language.

The two last volumes of Mr. M'Carthy's work will probably have been read with even greater eagerness than those which refer to the events up to the Crimean War. Generations soon pass, and the Treaty of Paris is already too old for the recollection of the majority of the readers of the day. We all like the records of events which we can ourselves remember. Curiously enough, the third volume almost completely coincides with what may be called the period of Lord Palmerston's supremacy. Lord Palmerston owed his hold on his countrymen to the common belief that he represented in some peculiar manner the feelings and wishes of those countrymen with regard to foreign affairs. After the Revolution of 1848 and the subsequent convulsions in Europe, and especially after the rise of the Second French Empire, foreign affairs began to engross the public attention to the exclusion of domestic questions, Lord Palmerston had come into power by a sort of exhaustive process after the collapse of the Aberdeen Government in the middle of the Crimean War. Lord Derby was unable to form a Government without him, and the other leaders were impossible. From that time to his death, in 1865, Lord Palmerston was certainly the most powerful man in England. The Orsini bombs displaced him for a time, and all the while that he was Prime Minister he hardly attached his name to any single great measure, leaving the work of legislation very much to his lieutenants, and especially to Mr. Gladstone, while he was well known as the one actual immovable obstacle in the way of a Reform Bill. Still he dominated Parliament and his country. Those were the days of the iniquitous Chinese war, as to which the constituencies so heartily supported the favourite Minister, in the face of the united opposition of the greatest names in the

country, Lord Derby, Lord John Russell, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Cobden, Mr. Disraeli. The general election of 1857 was a simple mandate from the country that Palmerston was better than all of these men put together. Then came the Divorce Act, about which, strange to say, Lord Palmerston was unusually in earnest, and then the incident of the Orsini plot, which led ultimately, it may fairly be said, to the Italian War, and which at all events unseated a Government and a Minister in England whose possession of power seemed to be assured for some years. The Indian Mutiny had begun while the debates on the Divorce Bill were proceeding, and it was not over before Lord Palmerston had to leave office on account of the Conspiracy Bill. The Conservatives remained in power on sufferance until the date of the Italian War in 1859, and then, when the Liberals made up their minds to unite and come in again, whatever other plans may have been formed, Lord Palmerston came to the front. From that time to his death, he was almost a dictator. His majority in the House of Commons was very small, usually, as Mr. Disraeli once said, a majority "in its teens." But it was enough for his purposes, and he did not exact from it any severe service. The Paper Duties were repealed, notwithstanding the unpopularity of the measure in many quarters and the strong opposition of the House of Lords. But this was Mr. Gladstone's doing. The French Treaty was made. But this was Mr. Cobden's doing. After all said and done, Lord Palmerston's name may be given but to one piece of legislature, and to one practical measure. The bit of legislature was the Divorce Bill, and the practical measure was the spending a large sum of money on fortifications. The hold of Palmerston on the country was never more clearly shown than in his successful defence of himself when attacked in both Houses of Parliament about the abandonment of Denmark. There was no defence to be made for him on grounds of reason. He had undoubtedly pledged himself and England to what he did not ask England to perform,—the defence of the little kingdom from which the Prince of Wales had so lately chosen his bride. He had simply blustered, and then run away from his pledges and promises. Nevertheless, he was too strong for his political enemies, though he was clearly in the wrong, and though his majority was so small.

Mr. McCarthy's estimate of Lord Palmerston strikes us as thoroughly just. Most certainly Palmerston did not raise the



standard of English statesmanship. He was not one of the great English Premiers, he could never be ranked with Pitt, or Canning, or Peel. We shall not say much about the two prominent figures in the last volume of this work, because they are still amongst us. All through the previous history they have been growing in importance—two men as different in character and gifts as it is well possible to conceive any English statesmen—and when Palmerston retires, they come almost at once to the front. Lord Russell cannot obscure Gladstone, and even the brilliant Lord Derby is but the lieutenant of Disraeli. After a time, the elder statesmen are removed by resignation and death, and the two political athletes are left to fight it out between themselves. The history reminds us of nothing so much as of the picture of Garrick between Comedy and Tragedy. Mr. Bull is Garrick, and he certainly takes first to the one and then to the other of his wooers. Unlike Palmerston, Russell, Derby, they have had to force their way in the rank and file of their parties, they have nothing about them of the amateur—nothing of the great English nobleman condescending to put his shoulder to the wheel, and mix himself in political conflict for the sake of the country. Gladstone and Disraeli are the two figures which fill the fourth volume of the work before us, for they have filled the political history and the minds of Englishmen during the period with which that volume deals. The talents, the merits, the faults of each are well estimated by Mr. M'Carthy, and, recognizing in him as we do so much of the judicial instinct of the true historian, we cannot profess not to agree with his relative judgment between the two, though we think he rates the one whom he admires least too high and the other too low.

But the true value of the book before us, the true value of any work that is fit in any sense to be called the History of our times, lies not in the political portraits or the estimates of individual actors on the great stage of English politics. Palmerston and Derby, Russell and Cobden, Gladstone and Disraeli, are all what they are and do what they do, by virtue of their temporary authorization for the ever-changing fickle English people, the one great character in the book. Some one has finely said, of the Historical Plays of Shakspeare, "the hero is England." We may say the same of the history of which we are speaking. England is the "hero" of Mr. M'Carthy's book—the hero in the dramatic and artistic sense, in which the word may often be



applied to very unheroic persons and characters. It is the England of the reign of Victoria—the England which went into a frenzy of enthusiasm when a young girl came to the throne, and which, to do it justice, has ever remained singularly constant in its loyalty to the Sovereign whom it has seen pass into the years of a long widowhood, and become a great-grand-mother. And yet it is the England which made so little account of the personal dislikes of its favourite Sovereign, that it made Palmerston its dictator after she had publicly quarrelled with him, and has quite lately ostracized the Minister of her predilection and placed the reins of government in the hands of the man against whom she is known to have spoken most strongly. It is the England which went half mad with anti-Popery at the bidding of Lord John Russell, but which paid no heed at all when Mr. Gladstone tried to revive in it the anti-Catholic feeling after the Vatican Council—though Mr. Disraeli could persuade it to make an abortive attempt to put down Ritualism by the Public Worship Regulation Act. It is the England which gave Mr. Gladstone the mandate to destroy the Irish Church Establishment, and to alter the Land Laws in favour of the tenant, but which would not allow him to be either generous or just in the matter of Catholic University Education. It is the England which has bullied China and Japan, and played so shabby a game, by the hands of Palmerston, with Naples, and Sicily, and the Pontifical States—the accomplice of Cavour, the fanatical applauder and idolizer of Garibaldi, but which has turned away, at the bidding of the same versatile Palmerston, from helping Poland when she might, and defending the rights of Denmark. It is the England that ejected its favourite from office for proposing the Conspiracy Bill, when it had just supported him against all right and justice in the affair of the “*lorcha Arrow*,” which was ready to fight America in the affair of the Trent, and then afterwards—most wisely and justly as we believe—made the unexampled concession of the Alabama arbitration. What a history of apparently grotesque inconsistencies the story makes! At one time Tory, at another Conservative, and all the while steadily marching in the direction of democracy! worshipping at one time Palmerston, at another Beaconsfield, sympathizing first with oppressed and massacred Bulgarians and Maronites, and then full of enthusiasm for the stately Turk, the “heroic” Osman, Circassians, Bashi-Bazooks, and what not, so long as they are

enemies of Russia! India, China, Afghanistan, Abyssinia, Ashantee, Zululand, the Transvaal—what a number of various lines of policy and tergiversations do the names call up! How have we fraternized with all the motley rulers of France, from Louis Philippe to Leon Gambetta, and sometimes bullied and sometimes crouched to the Prussia of Frederic William and the Prussia of Bismarck! How waywardly has this England dealt with its own best men—with Peel, and Gladstone, and Cardinal Newman, with Bright and Cobden, and half a dozen more—ready at one time to believe Kingsley, at another to laugh at his castigation, one day mobbing Mr. Gladstone in Harley Street and singing Jingo songs under the window of the War Office, at another laughing to scorn *Lothair* and *Tancred*, and applauding the execution, against the hapless Turk, of the very treaty which his discarded partisan had made in his interest. Passionate, changeable, headstrong, ignorant, illogical, never ready at a pinch for love of economy, and then spending millions wantonly, alternately overdoing the rewards of slender services and the chastisement of inevitable failures, overfull of self-confidence and dejected by sudden panics, eager for changes and angry because things are not left alone—sometimes too serious to bear with an amusing impostor, at others too frivolous to tolerate severe and earnest virtue,—certainly if the England of these days could be painted in a single character and put into a play, it would require a Shakspeare to do it justice.

And yet, through the whole story of the inconsistencies and absurdities of which the nation has been guilty, there are many signs indeed of its industry, its enlightenment, its sagacity, its prudence, and its generosity. There has, unless we are mistaken, been an almost continuous onward march in the way of improvement. Education has made wonderful strides, and hitherto the religious principle, if assailed, has not been eliminated. Every religious community in the land, with few exceptions, has raised its level. We must not be too proud of the increase of comforts, but at least the poorer classes share in the general rise. Crime has greatly diminished—we should be glad to say the same of vice. In our political life, we are free from the extravagancies and scandals which mar so many foreign systems, and party spirit, though it has often run far too high and hindered immense good, has not yet overmastered in the leaders of either of the great parties the love of country and devotion to the general

interests in the first place. The series of measures which have been intended for the relief of our great domestic wound, the misery of Ireland, has at least proceeded from a sincere desire to do justice and reverse the acts of the past. It may be that no English statesmen can be found who are to have the glory of reconciling Ireland, but if so, it will not be from want of will, and as Ireland is a Catholic nation, there is no need yet for despair. This means that Englishmen are open to conviction and can be led to lay aside deep-rooted prejudices. Nor can it be denied that the patience and forbearance of Englishmen has often been sorely tried, not by the Irish nation, but by the agitators or adventurers who have spoken in its name and posed as its representatives. Our foreign policy has been selfish and foolish, alternately the policy of bluster and the policy of prudence, but at least it does not contrast unfavourably with that of any of our neighbours, and the good sense of the country has escaped many a danger into which our passions might have led us. And, though we are so often unjust to our public men, we are, as Sir Robert Peel said of Palmerston himself, proud of them, and our democracy knows better than to carry the levelling system so far as to involve, as in America and France, the practical exclusion from the service of the country of her best and noblest sons.

Clumsy, narrow, bigoted, unreasonable as Englishmen often are, they still love their old traditions and do not mind being guided—kicking a little all the time—into sensible paths and to generous ends. They would not follow Louis Napoleon into all his schemes as to the map of Europe, they would not recognize the Southern States, they did not refuse the Treaty of Washington, they will not, as we hope, turn away from the last chance of dealing loyally with Irish questions. A great future is before us—at least an Englishman may think so. Our language is spoken more widely, we think, than any other language on earth. We have possessions in every part of the globe, and our flag floats on every shore. What will the future historian of our children's time have to say? Fifty years hence, will there be a great English Confederate Empire, with its truly Imperial Legislature and the principle of self-government established in all its States? Who will be the Gladstones and Beaconsfields, the Tennysons and Brownings, the Trollopes and Blacks of the day? What will be the issue of our continual progress to a more pronounced democracy, and, more than all, what will

be the outcome of the keen spirit of investigation in religious matters which now characterizes our population? The national life is as vigorous as ever—may its future developments be marked by the love of truth and of justice, the abandonment of obsolete prejudices, the sacrifice of absurd claims, and the reparation of ancient wrongs! The volumes before us reveal many dangers, and the possibility of many calamities—for they record the introduction of new elements into our political system, while, outside our own boundaries, the laws of nations are trampled under foot, and the earth is burthened by the weight of colossal armies. The generation now rising into manhood may have many perils, internal and external, to cope with, which we have been spared. The future seems to be full of gloom; let us at least hope that Englishmen will not be so foolish as to bring on, by their own acts, the ruin of the comparative prosperity and stability with which they have for so long been blessed!

### *Poisoning the Wells.*

THE controversial expedient of "poisoning the wells" has been immortalized by Cardinal Newman. It consists in bringing a direct charge of untruthfulness against your opponent, and giving your readers to understand that they must receive no statement of his as worthy of credit, until it has been personally tested and verified. It represents him as a thoroughly dishonest man, ready to resort to any evasion in order to bolster up the weakness of his cause. It is a shabby, unworthy trick, unless indeed you can prove the accused to be a deliberate deceiver, and that by incontrovertible evidence. But as long as there is the slightest chance of his being in good faith, it is, to say the least, a cruel injustice and wrong thus to cut the ground from under his feet.

But, if it is almost a crime thus recklessly and wantonly to "poison the wells" in the case of an individual opponent, what shall we say of one who deals thus with a Church which even he allows to be the mother of saints and martyrs? What excuse can be made for a writer who, on grounds the character of which we shall expose in the present article, hurls his poisoned weapon against her whom two hundred millions of mankind honour as the Church of the living God, and seeks, for reasons of his own, to induce his readers to accept the scandalous proposition that "the Roman Church is honeycombed through and through with accumulated falsehood"? It is with sincere pain that we find one who professes to be at least an honourable English gentleman, so blinded by the necessities of an untenable position as to bring against the Church and her children charges of deliberate fraud which are—to put the matter gently—wanting in any solid foundation. We should have scarcely thought that Dr. Littledale would have condescended to such a method of controversy, but unfortunately the unanswerable logic of facts convicts him.

Before we come to the charges themselves, we must say a word on the manner in which he opens the section which we are going to discuss. It is headed, "Roman Untrustworthiness,"

and begins with the following words: "The next valid reason (and especially for the unlearned) against joining the modern Church of Rome, is the entire disregard for truth exhibited in her polemics."

"*Especially for the unlearned.*" What does this mean? Does it mean that if a learned man join himself to a religion, "honeycombed through and through with accumulated falsehood," he is comparatively excusable, while a poor unlearned man who in his ignorance does the same, is without excuse? Does it mean that Cardinal Newman may be forgiven, in virtue of his talents and knowledge, for accepting a system "full of disregard for truth," but that the half-educated inquirer deserves no forgiveness?

Oh, Dr. Littledale, you cannot conceal the secret conviction that your accusations rest upon a foundation of sand; and so you seek to palm off your wares on those who you know cannot detect their true character. You are like the vagrant fortune-teller who says that she has good luck for poor servant-girls who cannot read and write, but none for the fine lady or gentleman; you are playing the miserable game of imposing by reckless statement on the poor unlearned, who cannot go to Mansi, or Hefe, or Fleury, to find out the true character of your charges. You know they will read your plausible misrepresentations, but that they have little or no chance of discovering the answer to them, and you therefore sow your evil seed broadcast, safe in the knowledge that the antidote is far to find, hidden away in storehouses more remote from the unlearned than the forests of Peruvian bark from him who is prostrate with the malaria of Rome. No wonder, then, that you appeal "*especially to the unlearned*"!

After these opening words follows a solemn homily on the vice of lying, supported by many quotations from Holy Scripture. We are glad to see that Dr. Littledale recognizes (at least in theory) the hatefulness of falsehood in God's sight, and is aware of the punishment it will receive hereafter. He then states his charge against the Catholic Church, in words which we must quote at length, as they are a key to the dispositions of our author, a good sample of the animus with which he writes.

"Nevertheless" [that is, in spite of the warnings of Holy Scripture], "the Roman Church, which professes to worship Him Who has said, 'I am the Truth,' is honeycombed through and



through with accumulated falsehood ; and things have come to this pass, that no statement whatever, however precise and circumstantial, no reference to authorities however seemingly frank and clear, to be found in a Roman controversial book, or to be heard from the lips of a living controversialist, can be taken on trust ; nor accepted, indeed, without vigorous search and verification. The thing *may* be true, but there is not so much as a presumption in favour of its proving so when tested. The degree of guilt varies, no doubt, from deliberate and conscious falsehood with fraudulent intent, down through mere reckless disregard whether the thing be true or false, to mere overpowering bias causing misrepresentation ; but truth, pure and simple, is almost never to be found, and the *whole* truth in no case whatever.”<sup>1</sup>

We ask the reader to pause for a moment and weigh Dr. Littledale's words. “The Roman Church is honeycombed through and through with accumulated falsehood.” “Truth, pure and simple, is almost never to be found in the pages of the Roman controversialist, or to be heard from his lips, and the *whole* truth in no case whatever.” It is indeed a terrible charge. It is scarcely possible to imagine an accusation more damning in the eyes of any honest man. Listen, saints and martyrs ; listen, St. Francis Xavier, Cardinal Bellarmine, St. Alphonsus, St. Francis of Sales, St. Philip Neri, Père Olivaint, and the Curé d'Ars : you belong to a Church honeycombed through and through with accumulated falsehood. Listen, Cardinal Newman ! In all that you have said and written in defence of the Catholic Church, truth pure and simple is almost never to be found, and the *whole* truth in no case whatever ! It is indeed a terrible charge. It is impossible to suppose that such an accusation in the mouth of a lover of truth, an honest English gentleman, can be brought forward without proofs quite irrefragable. Doubtless it will be supported by oft-recurring instances of deliberate falsehood on the part of Popes speaking *ex cathedra*, or at all events addressing individuals in an authoritative way. Doubtless we shall have a long list of official documents based on fraud, a long series of wilful and shameless misquotations and misrepresentations on the part of Catholic theologians, and many instances of deceit knowingly practised in the cause of the Church. But no, not one of these does he even attempt to establish. One or two second-hand calumnies quoted from the enemies of the

<sup>1</sup> *Plain Reasons against joining the Church of Rome*, pp. 100, 101.

Church, one or two simple facts which prove nothing at all, but which Dr. Littledale dresses up to suit his own purpose, one or two documents misquoted and facts misrepresented—are the crumbling foundation of the sweeping, cruel charge.

Even taking the number of his proofs, without looking to their character, how miserably does the indictment collapse! It is scarcely credible, but all the instances that Dr. Littledale's learning and careful investigation adduce amount to some half-dozen. Half a dozen in the course of eighteen hundred years! Suppose a man has an acquaintance whom he has known for some forty years, and for some reason or other is anxious to blacken him in the eyes of the world. He comes before the public, and addresses them as follows: "I have known this man for forty years and more. I have diligently inquired into his character and done my best to investigate his trustworthiness, and I think I have detected him no less than six times in misrepresentation more or less deliberate. I therefore call upon all honest men to stand aloof from one whose character is thus 'honeycombed through and through with accumulated falsehood. No statement that he makes, however seemingly frank and clear, can be taken on trust, nor accepted without rigorous search and investigation. Truth pure and simple is almost never to be found in his mouth, and the whole truth never.'" Who would not say that one who used such language had either bidden adieu to his senses, or was blinded by some secret spite or hatred of the accused? Even supposing that all the accusations were true, what would be more unfair than to base so heavy a charge on so flimsy a foundation? And if his acquaintanceship extended, not over forty years, but over forty times forty, how absolutely ridiculous it would become. And if, besides all this, it turned out that his proofs proved nothing at all, his words would be not only ludicrous, but positively criminal.

To show that Dr. Littledale's proofs prove nothing at all is the object of the present essay. We will take them one by one in the historical order in which they are brought forward by our author.

"The process [of polemical fraud] began early. In A.D. 419 a Council of the whole African Church was held at Carthage, and Faustinus, Bishop of Potenza, who was Legate of the Pope there, tendered in proof of the Pope's right to hear appeals from foreign Churches, certain canons of the local Synod of Sardica,

held in 347, and not received either in Eastern or Southern Christendom, as if they were canons of the General Council of Nicæa in 325, and universally binding. The Council had a search made in the archives of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, of course vainly, save that authentic copies of the Nicene canons were sent to it; whereupon it rejected the Sardican canons, had the genuine Nicene canons read and affirmed, and wrote to the Pope, complaining of the attempted fraud, and told him that nothing should make them tolerate such insolent conduct on his part. This letter was signed, amongst others, by the illustrious St. Augustine. Nevertheless, the same use was made of them by Pope Leo the Great only thirty years later, when the record of the matter was still fresh: and yet a third time by Felix the Third, to coerce Acacius of Constantinople."<sup>2</sup>

In this paragraph there are at least four statements contrary to fact:

1. It is not true that the Council of Sardica was a local synod and was not received either in Eastern or in Southern Christendom.
2. It is not true that the African Bishops rejected the Sardican canons.
3. It is not true that they wrote to the Pope complaining of the attempted fraud.
4. Still less is it true that they told the Pope that nothing should make them tolerate such arrogant conduct on his part.

We omit one or two minor inaccuracies, which will appear as we give the true account of the affair. And first of all we must premise that in many early copies of the Nicene canons those of Sardica are incorporated with them under the same heading, without any distinction being made between the two Councils, and under the general title of *Canones Synodi Nicenæ*. This sufficiently indicates the paramount authority attributed to Sardica. It was no local synod, as Dr. Littledale asserts; those who took part in it were summoned from every quarter of the world. It is called a great Council (*μεγάλη σύνοδος*) by St. Athanasius. Sulpicius Severus, the historian, describes it as called together from the whole world (*ex toto orbe convocata*), while Socrates, and after him the Emperor Justinian, actually give it a place among the General or Œcumenical Councils.

<sup>2</sup> P. 102.

Whether it was in the strict sense an Œcumenical Council would require a separate historical investigation: it is enough to say that Mansi, the great authority on the Councils, regards it as such, while the evidence used against it is chiefly negative.<sup>3</sup> But however this may be, its canons were universally received in the time of Pope Nicholas the First, who says of them: *Omnis Ecclesia recipit eos*. It is simply false to say that it was a local synod, or that its canons were not received either in Eastern or Southern Christendom.<sup>4</sup> These Sardican or Nicene canons, which from the first had been acted on in the Western Church, were not known at Carthage in 417. But certain questions of discipline had arisen in the African Church a short time previously, on which they had a very important practical bearing. A certain priest of Sicca, named Apiarius, had been deposed and excommunicated by his Bishop, Urbanus, on account of very serious charges that had been brought against him by the inhabitants of Tabraca. Thereupon he went to Rome, told his version of the story to Pope Zosimus, and appealed to him for redress. The Pope considered that he had been harshly treated, and sent instructions to Urbanus that he was to be reinstated. The African Bishops, who in their General Synod in 418 had inserted among its decrees one which ordered priests, deacons, and other clerics to appeal to local authority, and not to seek redress beyond the sea, were not satisfied with this summary termination of the affair, and Urbanus in particular showed some disposition to neglect the order of the Pope respecting Apiarius. Thereupon Pope Zosimus sent three Legates to Carthage to enforce his wishes. At a small local synod they read the instructions (*commonitorium*) given them by the Pope, of which the principal contents were as follows:

1. All bishops have a right of appeal to Rome from local authority.
2. The African Bishops are warned against too frequent attendance at Court.
3. Priests and deacons unjustly excommunicated by their bishop, have a right of appeal to neighbouring bishops.
4. Urbanus is threatened with excommunication, or with a

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also Palma, *Prel. Hist. Eccl.* ii. x. p. 85. "Fuisse œcumenicam synodum Sardinensem in controversiam vocari non potest. Nam cum certum est, ex universo orbe Episcopos ad illam habendam fuisse invitatos et revera convenisse, cumque ii una cum Romani pontificis legatis decreta ediderint, Ecclesiæ concilium generale constituerunt."

<sup>4</sup> "Concilii hujus decreta non solum ab occidentalibus sed ab orientalibus etiam durante sæculo iv. pro Nicenæ synodi decretis allegata fuerunt" (Palma, *ib.*).

summons to Rome, if he continues to hold out in his severe treatment of Apiarius.

For the first and third of these points the Pope quoted the enactments of the sixth and fourteenth canons of Nicæa. But the African Bishops, on turning to the copies in their possession of the Nicene canons, were unable to find those cited by the Pope. They did not know that they had been framed at Sardica, and were naturally in no small perplexity. If these canons were authentic, why were they absent from the copies current among them? They therefore determined to write to Pope Zosimus, informing him of their difficulty, and at the same time promising (and this fact of itself refutes Dr. Littledale's account of their proceedings) to obey the canons cited until the question of their authenticity should be decided. And there the matter rested for awhile. The Legates remained at Carthage carrying on negotiations, of which we have no details, though we learn from a letter of the Pope addressed to the Legates that they were of a most friendly character. Apiarius acknowledged his misdeeds, submitted to his Bishop, and was readmitted to communion.

Meanwhile search was made into various copies of the Nicene canons existing at Carthage, and into other documents relating to the Council of Nicæa. Cæcilianus, Archbishop of Carthage, had himself been present at the Council, and had deposited in his church a copy of its Acts, but not a trace could be found there of the canons in dispute. The matter was one of serious consequence to the African Episcopate, and accordingly in 419 a General Synod was held at Carthage for its further discussion. At the commencement of its session, Aurelius, the Archbishop, proposed the reading of the official copy which had been presented by Cæcilianus, but the secretary had scarcely commenced it when he was stopped by the Papal Legate, who reminded the synod that the right manner of proceeding was to begin with the reading of the Papal *com-monitorium*, and afterwards to discuss other documents. Aurelius, like a true son of the Church, at once assented, and the *commonitorium* was commenced. But no sooner have they come to the first of the canons in dispute when they are interrupted by Alypius, Bishop of Tagaste. He proposes that as on the one hand the Pope quotes the canon just read as a Nicene canon, and as on the other hand no trace of it exists in the official copy of the Church of Carthage, search should be made



into other copies existing at Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, and the Pope also should be requested to send on his part for correct copies of the documents in question to the same three cities. Until the arrival of the necessary documents the canons cited by the Papal Legate should be observed, but to the Acts of the present synod should be added a transcript of the Carthaginian copy of the canons.

Faustinus, the Legate, in his reply assured the synod that he did not regard the doubt thrown on the canons as any imputation on the Church of Rome, but proposes, in order to avoid any appearance of strife between the Churches, that the whole inquiry should be entrusted to the Pope.<sup>5</sup>

After some further discussion, in the course of which St. Augustine follows Alypius in professing their intention of observing the disputed canons until a more careful search has been made into the decrees of Nicæa, it was agreed that Aurelius should write to the Bishops of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, to ask for copies of the Nicene canons, and that a synodal letter should at once be addressed to the Pope. Of this letter, which is the one referred to by Dr. Littledale, we give a short summary.<sup>6</sup>

The Bishops desire to communicate to the Pope (Boniface) the satisfactory issue of the negotiations. Apiarius had been restored to the exercise of his priesthood in accordance with the Pope's command; but as he had acknowledged the truth of the charges laid against him, he had been removed from Sicca. The Bishops have listened to the *commonitorium* of the Papal Legates, containing two canons quoted as Nicene, though they themselves cannot find them in the copies to which they have access of the Acts of Nicæa. They have, however, caused these two canons to be inserted in the Acts of their synod until the arrival of correct copies of the Nicene canons. If these two canons should be found there, and if they are observed in the

<sup>5</sup> The words of Faustinus are, "Nec vestra sanctitas [Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage] præjudicat Ecclesiæ Romanæ, sive de hoc capitulo sive de aliis, quia dicere dignatus est frater noster et coepiscopus Aurelius dubios esse canones." Hefele (*Histoire des Conciles*, ii. 302) understands them somewhat differently.

<sup>6</sup> The reader will find the text of this letter in Mansi, iii. 830, iv. 419. We follow the Greek text, as the Latin is in several places quite unintelligible, and the two Latin versions which are extant are in one place contradictory of each other. We have inserted that part of the letter which has an especial bearing on the point at issue, and have given the two Latin and Greek versions, in order that the reader who has not the opportunity of consulting Mansi, may judge for himself of the meaning of the passage referred to by Dr. Littledale.



Church in Italy, then they have nothing more to say on the matter: otherwise they suppose that they are not compelled to accept them (for this seems to be the meaning of the obscure phrase, ἡ οὐχ ὑποφέρειν ἐπειγόμεθα), but trust that through God's mercy, as long as His Holiness Pope Boniface presides over the Church of Rome, they will not be subject to such haughty treatment (οὐκέτι λοιπὸν ὑπομένομεν τὸν τυφὸν τοῦτον). They ask that they may be dealt with in that manner which, even without any word on their part, fraternal charity would require, as well as the justice and wisdom with which God had endowed Pope Boniface, *if so be that the canons of Nicæa should order differently* (ἐὰν τυχὸν ἀλλοίως ἔχουσιν οἱ κανόνες τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνόδου). They have arranged to send to the East for further copies of the Nicene canons, and they again declare their submission to the disputed canons until they receive further information.

The following is the original of that portion of the letter, which is the subject of Dr. Littledale's accusation.

"Hæc utique usque ad adventum verissimorum exemplariorum Niceni Concilii inserta gestis sunt: quæ si ibi quemadmodum ipso quod apud nos fratres ex Apostolica Sede directi commonitorio allegaverunt, continentur, eoque ordine vel apud vos in Italia custodiuntur, nullo modo nos talia, qualia commemorare jam nolumus, vel tolerare cogemur: sed credimus adjuvante misericordia Dei nostri quod tua sanctitate Ecclesiæ Romanæ præsidente, non sumus jam istum typhum passuri. Et servabuntur apud nos, quæ nobis etiam non disserentibus, custodiri debeant cum fraterna charitate, quæ secundum sapientiam atque justitiam quam tibi donavit Altissimus, etiam ipse perspicis esse servanda: nisi si forte aliter se habent canones Concilia Niceni." <sup>7</sup>

In the Latin version given in Mansi, iv.,<sup>8</sup> after the words *tolerare cogemur*, the clause *vel intolerabilia patiemur* is inserted, and in the last sentence the word *nisi* is omitted, besides several other minor variations. The Latin text is evidently taken from the Greek, and is a very inaccurate version of it.

The Greek version is as follows: Ταῦτα δηλονότι ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τῶν ἀληθεστάτων ἐξέμπλων τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνόδου, τοῖς πεπραγμένοις ἐνεβλήθησαν, ἅτινα ἐὰν ἐκεῖ ὃν τρόπον ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ κομμονιτωρίῳ περιέχονται, τῷ ἡμῖν διὰ τῶν ἀποσταλέντων ἀδελφῶν ἐκ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς καθέδρας ἐμφανισθέντι, καὶ παρ'

<sup>7</sup> Mansi, iii. 833

<sup>8</sup> 512.

ὑμῖν τῇ αὐτῇ τάξει ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ φυλάττονται, οὐδαμῶς καὶ ἡμεῖς τῶν τοιούτων μεμνήσθαι βουλόμεθα· ἢ οὐχ ὑποφέρειν ἐπειγόμεθα, ἀλλὰ πιστεύομεν ὅτι βοηθούντος τοῦ ἐλέους Κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, τῆς σῆς ἀγιωσύνης προεστώσης τῆς Ρωμαϊκῆς ἐκκλησίας, οὐκέτι λοιπὸν ὑπομένομεν τὸν τυφὸν τοῦτον φυλαχθῶσι δὲ περὶ ἡμᾶς ἅτινα καὶ μὴ λαλούντων ἡμῶν ὀφείλουσι φυλαχθῆναι ἀδελφικῇ ἀγάπῃ, ἅπερ κατὰ τὴν σοφίαν καὶ δικαιοσύνην, ἣν σοι ὁ ὕψιστος ἐδωρήσατο, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔτι μὴν συνορᾶς ὀφείλει φυλαχθῆναι, ἐὰν τυχὸν ἄλλοίως ἔχουσιν οἱ κανόνες τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνόδου.

It is almost incredible that this letter, written as it was under very trying circumstances, and yet so full of respect and obedience, should be the one from which Dr. Littledale quotes to prove his point, or that he should have crowded into his account of it such a mass of misrepresentation and falsehood. The African Bishops were naturally, and perhaps justifiably, a little hurt at the high-handed manner in which they considered the Pope's Legates had dealt with them. Apiarius' story had been listened to and believed at Rome, and Urbanus had been ordered to reinstate him. He had obeyed, in spite of his private opinion that Apiarius had misrepresented matters to the Holy See; and we may remark, in passing, that this act of obedience was a very clear recognition of Papal jurisdiction. Besides this, the Bishops had had their local decrees rather summarily set aside by a couple of canons quoted to them as Nicene, but of which they could find no trace whatever. Yet, in spite of all this, they write submissively and with at least an implicit acknowledgment of the power of the Pope, not only to control them, but even to set aside if he chose the disciplinary decrees of Nicæa in particular instances where their enforcement might prove a hardship. The one word in which the sore feeling on the part of the Bishops shows itself is in their request to him to save them from the haughtiness (*τυφός*) they had formerly experienced. But even here, no less than from the beginning to the end of the story, their language is strangely at variance with that attributed to them by Dr. Littledale! Dr. Littledale's Bishops say, "Nothing, O Pope, shall make us tolerate such insolent conduct on your part." The true Bishops say, "We trust that in accordance with your Holiness' wisdom and justice, we shall not for the future encounter the haughty treatment we formerly met with." Dr. Littledale's Bishops say, "We reject the Sardican canons." The true Bishops say, "We

accept the (Sardican) canons till they are disproved, and what is more, we insert them provisionally in the Acts of our synod." Dr. Littledale's Bishops make inquiries at Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, and having there found out the truth, write to the Pope, "complaining of the attempted fraud." The true Bishops, before they make any inquiries at those cities, write to the Pope, informing him what they are going to do, and asking him to cooperate with them. Dr. Littledale's Bishops read and affirm the Nicene canons. The true Bishops do nothing of the kind. What shall we say to a champion of truth who maliciously or ignorantly (we hope the latter) thus distorts history to his own schismatical purpose?

We must add a word or two on the alleged fraud itself. We have already said that in all probability Sardica was a true Œcumenical Council, and was regarded as a sort of continuation of Nicæa. It was therefore natural to mass the canons of the two Councils together under one heading. To call this a "fraud," is about as reasonable as to call the insertion of an account of Moses' death in a book which bears his name a fraud, or to describe as a fraud the title of "Books of Samuel" (as the First and Second Books of Kings are called in the Hebrew) given to books which include a long period subsequent to the Prophet's decease. It is possible (though very unlikely) that the Pope may have imagined that the canons in question were really passed at Nicæa; it is far more likely that he was aware of the existence of the two sets of canons, and simply used the common nomenclature. Whichever explanation we adopt, the idea of fraud is out of the question, and for this reason the other pretended instances of the same use of these canons by Leo the Great and Felix the Third do not call for any separate discussion. If they did so use them, they were quite justified in doing so. In point of fact, Leo the Great, in the passage alluded to by Dr. Littledale, uses language which is equally applicable to the Nicene canons strictly so called, while the employment of them by Felix the Third as a means of coercing Acacius, is a fact of which we have as yet been able to find no trace in ecclesiastical history.

## II.

So far for proof the first of Roman untrustworthiness. The second is equally creditable to Dr. Littledale's historical accuracy and candour. It runs as follows: "The Roman Legates, at the

Council of Chalcedon in 451, produced a forged copy of the Nicene canons, containing in the sixth canon the words, 'The Roman See has always had the primacy,' which were promptly repudiated by the Council."

These few lines contain two false assertions and one serious inaccuracy.

1. It is not true that the Roman Legates produced a forged copy of the Nicene canons.
2. It is not true that these words were promptly repudiated by the Council.
3. The words themselves are not accurately quoted.

We will pursue the same course of telling the true story as briefly as we can, and then contrasting it with Dr. Littledale's perversion of it. The Council of Chalcedon in its fifteenth session had, after the withdrawal of the Papal Legates and the Imperial Commissioners, passed a canon raising the Church of Constantinople to an extravagant position of authority over the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch. In the following session the Papal Legate Paschasinus protested against this canon as contrary to the decrees of Nicæa, and read a Latin version of the sixth and seventh of the Nicene canons, in which the former begins with the words, *Quod Ecclesia Romana semper habuit principatum*, and then proceeded on the analogy of Rome's supremacy as metropolitan over the neighbouring Churches, to defend the rights of Alexandria and Antioch as the respective metropolitan Churches of Egypt and the East against the encroachments of Constantinople. When this version of the canon had been read, Constantine, the Secretary of the Council, read another and altogether different version, in which these words were omitted (though the substance of the two versions pretty nearly coincided), as well as several other decrees bearing on the same subject. The assembled Fathers, without one single remark on the difference of the two versions, proceeded at once to inquire of those Bishops who had signed on the previous day whether they had done so of their own free will, and of the two Bishops who had refused to sign, the cause of their refusal. It was on these points that the discussion turned, and not a word was said about Dr. Littledale's "forged" canon. At the end of the session the Imperial Commissioners proposed a resolution, of which we quote the opening words, since they have a very important bearing on our subject.

"The most illustrious Presidents said: 'We see clearly, both

from facts and from what every one has laid down, that before all indeed the Primacy and peculiar honour are reserved for the most well beloved of God, the Archbishop of ancient Rome, but that it is right that the most holy Archbishop of the royal Constantinople, the new Rome, should enjoy the same honourable precedence, and that he should have full and absolute power to elect the metropolitans in the dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace,' &c."<sup>9</sup>

Against this resolution, in spite of its open and unpromising assertion of Roman primacy, the Papal Legates again protested, as being an encroachment on the part of Constantinople on the rights of other sees, and contrary to the canons of Nicæa. It was, however, passed by the assembled Fathers, but the protest was inserted in the acts of the Council. When the conciliary decrees were referred to Rome for the necessary Papal sanction, the Pope refused to confirm the twenty-eighth canon of the Council, which had been passed in the absence of the Legates, and which unfairly exalted Constantinople, and consequently the resolution of the Commissioners given above fell to the ground with it, in so far as it re-asserted the claims of Constantinople, though it will ever remain as an irrefragable proof of the consensus of the Christian world as to the Roman primacy.

Such then is the true story. Let us look into it a little more closely, as the more we examine it the more we find in it a complete refutation of Dr. Littledale's impudent assertions. First of all there are still in existence various versions of the canons of Nicæa, and it is difficult to say which of them represents the exact words approved by the Council; there is certainly an *a priori* presumption in favour of the Roman version, though we do not assert that it is the most correct. But even supposing that the words cited by Paschasinus, the Papal Legate, did not belong to the canon, what right has

<sup>9</sup> Mansi ix. 451. Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες εἶπον· Ἐκ τῶν πεπραγμένων καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐκδότου καταθέσεως, συνορώμεν πρὸ πάντων μὲν τὰ πρωτεία, καὶ τὴν ἐξαιρετον τιμὴν, κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας τῇ τῆς πρεσβυτέρου Ρώμης θεοφιλεστάτῃ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ φυλάσσεσθαι· χρῆναι δὲ τὸν δσιώτατον ἀρχιεπίσκοπον τῆς βασιλίδος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως νέας Ρώμης τῶν αὐτῶν πρεσβείων τῆς τιμῆς ἀπολαβεῖν καὶ αὐτὸν ἐξ ἀθηνταίᾳ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν τῶν χειροτονεῖν τοὺς μητροπολίτας ἐν τε τῇ Ἀσιανῇ καὶ Ποντικῇ καὶ Θρακικῇ ταῖς διοικήσεσι, κ.τ.λ. The reader will notice the distinction between τὰ πρωτεία, the primacy over all, and τὰ πρεσβεῖα, the precedence over local sees. The former was peculiar to Rome, the latter the Council wished to give to Constantinople on the same footing as it was exercised by Rome. The Latin version of the Acts of the Council incorrectly translates both πρωτεία and πρεσβεῖα by *primatus*.

Dr. Littledale to call it a "forged" version? What an unjustifiable imputation on the character of the Papal Legates! This system of attributing unproved crimes, or at all events allowing them to be read between the lines, is unworthy of any honest man.

We must also remark that the point in dispute was in no sense the primacy of Rome, but the right of Constantinople to high-handed jurisdiction over the Churches of the East. Dr. Littledale would lead us to imagine that the Legates forged this canon in order to establish the disputed primacy of Rome, whereas the primacy was never called into question. It was Antioch and Alexandria whose rights were in danger; on the claims of Rome all the members of the Council were unanimous.

Dr. Littledale asserts that the Council promptly repudiated the version of the Papal Legates. They did nothing of the sort. Practically they admit its correctness. Two versions are read to them of the canon, and without any comment they accept a resolution which embodies the very words with which the Papal version commences, while the alternative version they set aside altogether. Does Dr. Littledale understand what words mean, or is it that he blindly copies second hand the misrepresentations of other enemies of the Holy See? The Imperial Commissioners assert with far greater emphasis, and in more complete terms than the "forged" canon of the Legates, the primacy of Rome, and yet, in spite of this, the Papal Legates resist and oppose the resolution of the Commissioners. If Dr. Littledale's theory were correct, how eagerly they would have welcomed such an assertion of Roman claims, adopted too by the assembled Council. Instead of this they not only take it as a matter of course, but, in their impartial jealousy for the local rights of other sees, they protest against it, and the Pope refuses to confirm it.

Lastly, Dr. Littledale does not even quote the words of the Legatine version correctly. Paschasius speaks of the *Church* of Rome, not the *see* of Rome. The difference is not an unimportant one. It shows that he was speaking primarily of the jurisdiction of Rome over the Churches of Italy, not to its jurisdiction over the whole world. The Holy See (*cathedra*) is the abstract equivalent of the Pope; the Church of Rome (*ecclesia*) primarily suggests the Bishop of Rome, the local primate of Italy. The rest of the canon, which deals with the



relations of primates to their metropolitans, shows this clearly enough. Dr. Littledale, by substituting the word *see* for *Church*, distorts the meaning, and throws in a *souçon* of a claim to universal dominion which is not the object aimed at in the words themselves.

### III.

Dr. Littledale's next proof of Roman untrustworthiness is the "falsifications" of the Breviary. Out of many instances he selects one, "because of the impossibility of disputing the fact that it is a lie, and is known to be such by the Roman authorities." In the Life of St. Sylvester read on December 31 is inserted a "fable which was invented in the fifth century, that the Emperor Constantine the Great was a leper, and was healed of his disease at Rome by means of baptism, administered to him there by Pope Sylvester, whereas it is a matter of history recorded by St. Jerome that he was baptized on his death-bed in Nicomedia, an Asiatic city, by Eusebius, its Bishop." And what is worse, the "fable" was invented for a political purpose, because Constantine is represented as making over to the Pope's sovereignty Rome and the adjacent territory, in gratitude for his cure, and this is known in history as the famous so-called "Donation of Constantine." It is really hard to deal patiently with such a controversialist as Dr. Littledale, who scatters his random charges broadcast, hoping that at least some of the mud will cling to the minds of his readers. But we are glad that he has brought this accusation, because it gives us an opportunity of explaining to our readers what amount of authority the Breviary has. When the canonization of any saint comes before the Sacred Congregations at Rome, a very careful and searching inquiry is made into the authenticity of the miracles performed by him, and into every proof which is adduced of his holiness. If they pass the examination, and the saint is declared worthy of being added to the list of those whose *cultus* the Church approves, the local authorities, or, if he is a religious, the authorities of his Order, are requested to draw up a set of lessons for his Office in the Breviary. These lessons are then submitted to the Sacred Congregation, which, however, does not pronounce upon the authenticity of every fact therein contained (for this would be an almost impossible task), but simply on their general character, as containing nothing contrary to faith or morals. Such is the modern process. In early days the general voice of the faithful, proclaiming the

extraordinary holiness of the Saint, the miracles he performed, his heroic virtues, his wonderful repute for sanctity, was the occasion which led to his being canonized, and contributed the materials for his office. But alike in the ancient and in the modern process, the Breviary, though on the whole exceedingly correct, has no sort of official recognition as a record of facts and as a collection of matters of history; and any Catholic is at liberty to reject, on grave and sufficient grounds, any statement of fact therein contained, so long as his denial does not involve any point of faith or of morals. Every well educated Catholic knows that there are several lessons which historical criticism has shown to be doubtful, if not absolutely irreconcilable with facts, and Catholic theologians have written dissertations proving them to be of dubious origin, and in some cases to be distinctly incorrect.

Now let us suppose that the authorities at Rome, as soon as they considered that one of these lessons had been seriously questioned by scientific inquiry, were to order it at once to be expunged from the Breviary, what would be the result? First of all, every priest in the whole world would have to alter his Breviary. If there are two hundred million Catholics in the world, there must be at least some one hundred thousand priests, every one of whom would find that the lessons he had been saying all his life had all at once to be given up. What endless confusion this would cause! what annoyance and inconvenience! what disorder and uncertainty! Each of these one hundred thousand priests must get a new Breviary, or at all events a supplement of corrigenda. And when the change was made, what would be the practical gain? Certain pious and edifying stories would have been given up, because historical criticism had pronounced against them. Who does not dislike to have a long cherished belief rudely overthrown, even though he is at the same time convinced that this belief lacked foundation in fact? Who thanks the merciless critic, tearing to pieces the stories familiar to him from childhood, even though at the same time those stories are shown to be wholly mythical?

But Truth is very sacred, and if once for all the falsity of any stories in the Breviary could be demonstrated with unquestioned certainty, it might be desirable to expunge them, whatever annoyance and inconvenience it might cost to all who say the Divine Office. But, in point of fact, how many are there out of the doubtful stories current in the

Breviary, in saints' lives, or in the various annalists of the Church, of which we can say with absolute and mathematical certainty that it is contrary to fact? Let us suppose what would be certain to occur if Rome showed herself ready to alter the "legends" to be found in the Breviary. Some doubtful story would be rejected by critics—their objections are reasonable enough; it is impossible apparently to reconcile the story in question with some certain historical data. Rome listens to their condemnation of the story, and orders it to be omitted from the Breviary as false. After some years new facts come to light, fresh records are unearthed from some hiding-place where they had been concealed for centuries; a new solution of the apparently insoluble difficulty presents itself, and the apparent "fable" turns out to be a fact. Who would not then regret that the wiser policy of patient expectation had been set aside for such an ill-judged desire for reform? Would not Dr. Littledale and his school be the first to point the finger of scorn at a Church thus stultifying herself, altering and then altering again, declaring some statement to be false and afterwards finding it out to be true? Wisely then does the Church abstain from the only alternative to her present patient forbearance. Rarely, at long intervals, she does now and again revise her Breviary, and correct, expunge, and re-model. When the time for such a revision has arrived is known to her and her Divine Teacher, not to Dr. Littledale and her other ignorant assailants.

The story which Dr. Littledale calls a "lie, known to be such by the Roman authorities," is a good instance in point. It is one of those "legends" which are still under discussion, and is stoutly maintained by at least one modern Catholic historian. Darras, in his *Church History*,<sup>10</sup> discusses it *per longum et latum*, and pronounces decidedly in favour of the baptism by Pope Sylvester. Whether he is right or wrong in the conclusion he arrives at is nothing to our present purpose. We are only concerned to show that the story in the Breviary is not "a lie, known to be such by the Roman authorities," and that Dr. Littledale, as usual, brings charges which he cannot prove. A delicate and difficult question is still under discussion. Nothing but a very careful investigation into the original authorities can justify an opinion, however tentative, on the one side or the other. Great names can be quoted on either side. The Catholic world still waits for some

<sup>10</sup> Darras' *Histoire Générale de l'Eglise*, vol. ix. pp. 72—98.

decisive criticism; when in steps this shallow Protestant scribbler, and cuts the Gordian knot by calling the story which he desires to malign "a fable invented for a political purpose," and tells us that he singles it out, because of the impossibility of disputing the fact that it is "a lie." Verily, if one fool can ask a question which many wise men cannot solve, we may say that one Dr. Littledale can settle a question of historical criticism which the investigation of many learned men have as yet failed in unravelling. No wonder that he appeals especially to the "unlearned!"

## IV.

The next of Dr. Littledale's proofs is a silly accusation adduced against the Pope Stephen the Second. "In the year 754," he says, "Pope Stephen the Third forged a letter in the name of the Apostle St. Peter, and sent it to Pepin, King of France, calling on him to come to the defence of the Pope and the city of Rome against the Lombards; which he accordingly did, and bestowed on the Pontiff a great territory containing more than twenty cities, the first beginning of the temporal power. Fleury, in recording this event, describes it as an artifice without parallel before or since in Church history! That is how the Pope first became a King, and a very creditable story it is."<sup>11</sup>

Now, it is perfectly true that Stephen the Third, hard pressed by the Lombards, wrote a touching letter of appeal to King Pepin and the other Christian princes, to all abbots, priests, dukes, counts, and soldiers, and to all the people of France, begging for aid against the foe, since the Holy City itself was in danger, and this letter he headed, "Peter, called to be an Apostle of Christ, . . . and Stephen, Bishop of the same Church (of Rome) to you Pepin, Charles, and Carlomann," &c. But to call this a forgery is simple malice. Let us suppose a parallel case. The General of the Franciscans, hard pressed by want of funds to carry on the good works for which the sons of St. Francis are everywhere famous, writes a letter to the Christian world, and begins it thus, "Francis, the servant of God, and M., the General of the Franciscans, to all Christian princes, nobles," &c. Who would say that the Father General had "forged" a letter in the name of St. Francis? It is true that the Gallican, Fleury, not without a dash of Gallican malice,

<sup>11</sup> P. 102.

calls the letter of the Pope an artifice without parallel—though if he means by this that it is a singular instance of the kind, he is perfectly correct. But the insinuation that Pope Stephen tried to induce King Pepin to believe that St. Peter himself, who had been dead some seven hundred years before, was the writer of the letter, is an insult alike to the intelligence of King Pepin and to the common sense of the reader. The Pope, in appealing to the faithful in Peter's name, was reminding them that it was St. Peter's authority which he bore, that it was the city of St. Peter that was in danger, that it was St. Peter who, from his throne in Heaven, still watched over the flock of which he had been the first pastor. And King Pepin recognized the claim on his loyalty to Peter, drove back the foe, and saved Rome from future danger by his gifts of territory to the Holy See. And a very creditable story it is (if we may use in earnest the words which Dr. Littledale uses in silly sarcasm), creditable to the devoted Pope, creditable to the brave army which came to his defence, creditable to the loyalty and generosity of the French monarch.

## V.

We pass over the False Decretals, which we must reserve for a future article, and come to the last of Dr. Littledale's second-hand calumnies. This time it is not the Pope he attacks, but an individual annalist, the great Baronius. "Baronius has also falsified the Roman Martyrology, by inserting statements that various early bishops, whose mere names stand in the old editions, were consecrated and given missions to different Churches by St. Peter from Rome, so as to make Rome appear the Mother-Church of those places. And he has altered the date of St. Denis of Paris by two hundred years with this same view."<sup>12</sup>

Poor Baronius re-edits the Roman Martyrology, finds in all sorts of ancient documents details respecting the Lives of the Saints which were not generally known before, and inserts such of them as seem to him worthy of credit and suitable to the purpose in the new edition. Dr. Littledale, borrowing from Janus, and venturing a little further even than his original, accuses him of inventing these details. Even Janus only insinuates that he took them from untrustworthy sources. But Dr. Littledale has no scruples of conscience as to his method of attack. The *various* early bishops to whom he alludes figure in the pages of Janus as only two in number—Memmius, first

<sup>12</sup> P. 104.

Bishop of Chalons, whose very name testifies to his Roman origin, and whom the Gallican Martyrology itself describes as sprung from the ancient *noblesse* of Rome, and ordained Bishop by St. Peter himself;<sup>13</sup> and Julian, Bishop of Le Mans, who, according to tradition, was identical with Simon the Leper, who entertained our Lord on the occasion of the anointing of His feet by St. Mary Magdalene, and who is said to have been afterwards ordained bishop and sent into Gaul by St. Peter. A more probable story represents him as belonging to a later period, and as having received his mission from Pope Clement. But whichever of these is the true story, they are equally Roman, and therefore afford no sort of ground for Dr. Littledale's calumnious charges.

The concluding sentence of Dr. Littledale's attack on the great annalist is indeed worthy of its author. "Baronius has altered the date of St. Denis of Paris by two hundred years." What does this mean? It ought to mean that he has falsified some document which fixed the period when St. Denis lived, and this it may be that Dr. Littledale wishes his readers to gather from the vague phrase. Or at least it would mean that having before him authors who fixed the date of St. Denis in the third century, he had on his own responsibility altered it to the first. Who would believe that Baronius, who identifies St. Denis the Areopagite with St. Denis of Paris, is stating the traditional belief current in the Church? and that he is supported by Hilduinus, Natalis Alexander, Hincmar of Rheims, and the Venerable Bede? We do not say that he is correct in his opinion; the Bollandists believe the two saints to have been altogether different personages, but at all events it is quite untrue to say that he altered the date of St. Denis. And what shall we say again of the motive attributed to this distinguished writer? He did it "so as to make Rome appear the Mother-Church of Paris."

Oh, Dr. Littledale, lover of truth, who are you who impeach those whose veracity is unimpeachable? Who are you who heap up calumny on calumny, misstatement on misstatement, and then, with an arrogance almost incredible, assume to yourself that power which the Most High has reserved to Himself, the gift of reading the secrets of hearts and the hidden motives

<sup>13</sup> "Catalauniæ natalis S. Memmii primi illius civitatis episcopi, qui Romæ antiquissima nobilitate ortus . . . ab ipso apostolorum summo ordinatus epûs, ad ecclestem Christi legem in hac civitate promulgandam in Galliam directus est" (Gallican Martyrology for August the 5th, quoted in the *Acta Sanctorum*).



of the actions of men? Who are you that you should accuse the Papal Legates of fraud and forgery, the historians of the Church of wilful deception in order to advance the cause of Rome—nay, the Pope himself, of forging a letter in the name of St. Peter, and palming it off upon the faithful? Who are you that you should quote documents you have never read, and talk glibly about matters of history of which you are grossly ignorant? Who are you that you should throw the stumbling-block of your calumnies in the way of those poor souls who are searching after the truth, and who are misled by your facile pen, by your high-flown talk about truth, by the shameless misstatements in which you give the lie to your own professions? You are he whom we have shown in these pages to have misquoted and misinterpreted over and over again, to have drawn conclusions which the premises do not justify, to have shut your eyes to all that meets your difficulties and sets aside your objections, to have put forward arguments which you must know prove nothing, and instances and illustrations which are entirely beside the mark. Few men of our time have crowded so many positive statements into so few pages as yourself, and few men in any time have ever been found out to be so uniformly inaccurate in quotations and assertions as yourself. From St. Irenæus and Origen down to St. Alphonsus and Cardinal Newman, it is difficult to find a great name in ecclesiastical history as to which you are guiltless. No wonder you accuse the Church of falsification: that is the sort of charge which we expect to find, as by a judicial instinct, in your mouth. It is for others' sake that we write rather than for yours; it is they who move our compassion. You fling your garbage at the immaculate Spouse of Christ: it sullies not her purity, but alas! it scares away those poor wandering children of hers whom she is calling back. It is to them that you owe that reparation and retractation which we hope that like an honest man you will make before it is too late.

We have used hard words respecting you, but it has been for the sake of those poor sheep whom you warn away from the Waters of Life. Confess your mistakes, your inaccuracies, your reckless misstatements. Come with a contrite heart to the feet of that mighty Mother whom you have assailed: and you will be joyfully welcomed by her, of whose claims on your obedience you seem to be half conscious even when you most wantonly assail her and attack most fiercely her devoted children.

RICHARD F. CLARKE.

### *Agrarian Contests in Ancient Rome.*

MY intention in this paper is to give a connected view of the various internal dissensions which disturbed the Roman Republic, so far as they bear upon the condition of the poor, and not merely on the interests of parties. I should wish to show the true significance of that continual war of classes which endangered the unity and safety of the Commonwealth during the first two centuries; which was then allayed for a hundred and eighty years, during the period of foreign conquest; but which broke out again under the leadership of the Gracchi, and at length overthrew for ever the aristocratic government of Rome. This at least is what I had desired, but as my space is so limited, and the subject is so large, I shall not be able to give a detailed account of more than the first of these periods, that, namely, which ended with the legislation of Licinius in B.C. 366.

In the beginning of the Republic we find the Romans divided into three classes. The relative numbers of these classes we are wholly unable even to guess, but the whole population at this time is estimated by Dr. Mommsen at about 80,000 persons, inhabiting a territory of at least 420 square miles. Of these 420, he calculates that not much more than 190 square miles were cultivated land. The rest would be waste-land, land covered by hamlets and villages, and especially pasture-land. To the actual numbers I have just cited, I do not give any importance, except so far as they help us to form some picture in our minds of the small beginnings of the greatest commonwealth of antiquity.

It would be a territory lying almost wholly on the south side of the Tiber, stretching about fifteen miles eastward from the city, and another fifteen miles westward to the sea, and having southwards an average expanse of fourteen miles. It was therefore about half the size of Attica. As I have said much of this land was either waste or pasturage. A large part

of the wealth of the early Romans consisted in their cattle, as is evident from the fact that *pecunia*, the Latin word for money, is derived from *pecus*, cattle. But those parts which were cultivated, were cultivated to the utmost that agricultural skill was then capable of, and supported a densely-crowded population. The farms of the ordinary peasants were small, varying between two and seven acres. The farmer and his sons guided the plough, for slaves were as yet very rare and possessed only by the rich. The vine, the olive, and the fig were the fruits most assiduously cultivated, and were intimately bound up with the religion, the sacred rites, and the legends of the people. The arable land was sown mostly with spelt; wheat and other kinds of grain were imported from Sicily. The fields were ploughed and re-ploughed with the utmost diligence, and the furrows were drawn so close that very little harrowing was required.<sup>1</sup> Such was the Roman Campagna then, the beautiful cradle of many happy children of nature. What it is at this day every one knows; and it will be part of my task to show how this desolation, which began in the last century of the Republic, or even before, was the direct result of the traditional policy of the Roman nobles.

It is impossible now to determine what proportion of the then population were freeholders, and how many were tenants and dependants (*clients* they would be called at Rome) of the rich. But it is probable that the second class, that of the clients, was far the more numerous; for it comprised not only the rural tenants and farm-labourers of the patricians, but also their tenants in the city: for all the land on which the city was built belonged to the patricians. The great body of these urban clients was of course composed of the guilds of artisans, who in early Rome were a class of great importance: they were the coppersmiths, the goldsmiths, the carpenters, the fullers, the dyers, the potters, and the shoe-

<sup>1</sup> Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, vol. i. p. 37 note: "A French statist, Bureau de la Malle, compares with the old Roman Campagna the district of Limagne in Auvergne, which is likewise a wide, much intersected and uneven plain, with a superficial soil of decomposed lava and ashes, the remains of extinct volcanoes. The population, at least 2,500 to the square league, is one of the densest to be found in purely agricultural districts. Property is subdivided to an extraordinary extent. . . . If instead of this arrangement, the same land were to be divided among six or seven great landholders, and a system of management by stewards and day-labourers were to supersede the husbandry of the small proprietors, in a hundred years the Limagne would doubtless be as waste, forsaken and miserable, as the Campagna of Rome is at the present day."

makers, besides two guilds of musicians, the horn-blowers for the army, and the flute-blowers for sacrifices and festivals. The institution of these nine guilds was ascribed by the Romans to Numa: in other words, they were considered to have existed in the city from time immemorial. It was not till the successes of the Romans in war had made slaves plentiful, that the mechanical arts began to be monopolized by slaves and freedmen, and to fall into that contempt in which they were afterwards held by all free-born Romans, even the poorest. Let us now return to the country, for there resides the strength of Rome, and see the condition of the clientela there.

Tradition universally points to the foundation of Rome by conquest. The story generally received among the Romans themselves was, that they were a colony from the Latin city of Alba Longa, which colony being the only Latin town upon the banks of the Tiber, obtained the command of the maritime commerce of Latium, and quickly became its emporium, and grew stronger than any other of its cities; so strong, indeed, that it was able to make war upon its mother city, raze her to the ground, take her land for its own, and succeed to her place as leader of the Latin confederacy. This story modern writers have rejected as not proved, and have supplied its place with conjectures which are incapable of proof. But whatever its truth may be, this much is certain, that the status of the patricians at Rome, before the plebs broke down the barriers which defended their exclusive privileges, was the position of conquerors among the conquered. Now the manner of dealing with the lands and persons of conquered nations in antiquity was much the same everywhere. Those inhabitants of the subjugated country who submitted early, and thus obtained good terms, were left in possession of their lands, and became free and independent subjects of the victorious State. Of those who fought for liberty, some, probably the most dangerous, were reduced to actual slavery, but the greater number were deprived merely of the ownership of their land, which was either divided as private property among the victors, or set apart as the domain of the State or the King. But such lands could not till themselves, and none were so well able to till them as those who had lived on them from their youth. And so their new masters, whether subjects or Sovereign, contented themselves with taking away the freehold of the land from the former cultivators, and allowed them to keep the enjoyment of their patrimony as a fief, subject

to arbitrary rents and burdens, and civil disabilities. Their persons were free, and they had all the rights of citizenship with regard to personal property. But they were attached to the soil, which they could not quit without the permission of their landlords. Of such a modified kind of slavery we have examples not only from antiquity, but also in the serfs of Russia, the villeins of Norman England, and generally the European serfs of the middle ages. Such a servitude, but very severe in degree, was that of the Helots in Laconia, and such also, but milder, was the clientship at Rome.

It is by no means certain, however, that the Roman rural clients were really *adscripti glebæ*—"attached to the soil." But neither was this the greatest hardship in the serf's lot. In a primitive state of society, thousands will pass their whole lives without sleeping three nights running out of the cottage bequeathed to them by father and grandfather. Forced and unpaid labour, arbitrary rents, the obligation of reaping his lord's crops while his own are spoiling: these are some of the real grievances of the serf.

The burdens to which the Roman client was liable were, as enumerated by Dionysius, to contribute to the marriage of the patron's daughters, if the patron was poor; to ransom him or his sons if taken prisoners, to help him to pay the costs of a lawsuit, or any fine to which he might be condemned; and lastly, to bear a part of the patron's expenses if he were chosen for any of the offices of State—for the Romans never paid their magistrates. It may easily be imagined, as the patricians grew richer and richer, how galling must have been to the subject class this obligation to pay expenses, which their rulers were well able to pay for themselves; and bitterer still their feelings when a gay nobleman, who had run through his property in rioting, suddenly found himself in want of a large sum of money to enter on a consulship, and in the necessity of screwing it somehow out of his clients. It is true that in the ideal conception of the clientela, the patron was looked upon as the father and protector of his clients; he was considered infamous if he allowed them to be reduced to beggary, and was accursed if he acted towards them fraudulently. But so were the Spartans threatened with the wrath of the gods if they exacted more than a fixed contribution from the Helots: yet we know how that unfortunate race was oppressed. Besides a vast amount of misery can be inflicted on a

tenant short of being turned out on the road to beg, and the early Roman law was so extremely severe, inhuman even, that the patron would seldom want to employ actual fraud to carry out his plans of extortion. He acted within the law if he claimed his dues to the last piece of copper, regardless of bad seasons, of hostile raids, or any other opportunities of showing that he possessed the merciful nature of a man.

And yet, however oppressive the condition of the clients, it might and did happen sometimes that the hardships endured by the freehold peasantry were still more grievous. We have seen that in ancient conquests it was seldom that all the land of the subjugated people was confiscated. Therefore it is probable that from the very beginning there existed at Rome a free peasant class alongside of the patricians and their clients. (I may here remark that when I talk, or shall talk, of free peasants in distinction from clients, I mean *free* in the sense not only of personal freedom, but also of complete independence of any vassalage not wholly voluntary.) This class would naturally be augmented in various ways. The members of all Latin cities had, by virtue of the Latin confederacy, the right of settling at Rome and acquiring property both real and personal. And as Rome became more and more the mistress of Latium, the concourse of strangers continually swelled the ranks of the plebeians.

Again, a client in prosperous times would often be in a condition to purchase his holding, and the patron would sometimes, though perhaps not very often, be willing to sell. Lastly, parts of the Roman land, as I described it at the beginning of this paper, did not belong to its oldest territory, the *Priscus Ager Romanus*, as it was called, but were acquired by fresh conquests; such parts, for example, as the land round the Alban Lake. Now when such annexations were made, the majority of the inhabitants became Roman citizens, some as clients, but many as free peasants, in the manner I have set forth above. But the whole of this class of plebeians were, until the year 366 B.C., when the consulship was opened to the plebeian order, politically the subjects of the hereditary *noblesse*, just as much as the clients were. They could not marry into a patrician *gens*; if they did, their children were not Roman citizens; they could not aspire to obtaining the honours of the State; and as there was no written code of laws till the Decemvirate, and the magistrates who dispensed justice were



patricians, the patricians were able to keep the plebeians in complete ignorance of the principles on which the law was administered. All these barriers were broken down one after another, in contests which, as only indirectly bearing on our subject, I shall not enter into at length. I am not concerned with the wealthy plebeians, who longed for the purple border and the ivory chair; but I am concerned with the poor, whose modest dwellings were never likely to be adorned with the images of deceased *consulares*. It is true that the champions of political reform often fought side by side with the champions of social reform, and where they do so their efforts will of course have a part in this narrative. But the chief object of our attention is to be the great struggle between peasant and landowner, the peasant fighting to emancipate himself, or to keep himself free from feudal tyranny, the landowners thinking of nothing else but the enlargement of their estates.

Dr. Mommsen well points out that the policy of the patrician government of Rome was in this respect just the opposite of the policy of the kings. If anything is certain from the stories of Ancus Martius and Servius Tullius, it is that the wisest of the Roman kings, like the wise sovereigns of every age, did all they could to foster the growth of the free peasant class as a counterbalance to the power of the nobles. But now that the abolition of the monarchy had made the nobles masters of the State, the annual magistracy, even when the consuls were upright and liberal men, being utterly inadequate to check their covetousness, they were able to exert all their power to try and monopolize the ownership of the soil, and to reduce the whole plebs to a state of dependence. Nothing is more plain from the early history of Rome, as we have it, than that this was their policy. Thus it is apparent, and is allowed by all, that the commons gained very little by the expulsion of the kings. Tarquin the Proud, indeed, was a tyrant to all classes alike, making the poor work at his great public buildings as the Egyptians made the Jews work at theirs. But the tyranny of an individual lasts but one generation, or at most two: a corporation of tyrants may plunder, and speculate, and oppress, with little fear that in its case will be exemplified the words of Scripture, "He that heapeth up riches by usury and loan gathereth them for him that will be bountiful to the poor."

In the beginning of this contest, the external circumstances in which the infant Republic was placed were all in favour of

the rich. Want and distress produced by external causes were their opportunities, of which they took unsparing advantage. Under the rule of the later kings, Rome had been a powerful State, ruling over a large part of Etruria, and feared by all her neighbours. But after the expulsion of the house of Tarquin, the pillar of her greatness abroad, as tyrants so often are, we find the Romans so far from ruling among their neighbours, that they are forced to fight for their very existence against hostile tribes pressing in upon them on all sides. The stories of Lars Porsena of Clusium, of Coriolanus and Cincinnatus, though told to us by Romans, and therefore displaying Roman vanity in glaring colours, tell us plainly enough that Rome was successively defeated by the Etruscans, the Volscians, and the Æquians, her territory wasted, and her independence only preserved by hard fighting. Thus harassed, the sufferings of the Roman farmers may easily be imagined. As Dr. Arnold observes: "A population of free landowners naturally engages the imagination; but such a state of society requires either an ample territory or an uninterrupted state of peace, if it be dependent on agriculture alone."<sup>2</sup> But when the territory of such a State is small, and its peace continually disturbed, the war-service tears the farmers from their fields in the early spring, and when they return to them in the autumn, if they are so happy as not to find them wasted by the enemy, the crops have suffered much by the absence of those who should have tended them. A succession of such summers spent by the farmer in the field of war instead of in the corn-field must inevitably cause a great falling-off in the value and prosperity of the farms, in the amount of the yearly produce, and above all in the zeal of the husbandman in tilling the soil, the fruits of which he knows he may never enjoy. And if having lost in this manner a great part of two successive crops, the unfortunate husbandman returns from his third campaign to find this time his vines and olives cut down by the sword, his milch cow and draught ox driven away, his cottage burnt, his wife and children, if not carried off, remaining only to burden him in their houseless condition—what is he to do? What did he do at Rome? He borrowed, and by borrowing added tenfold to his misery.

Here we have the first instrument of oppression employed by the rich, usury. How deeply rooted the passion for borrowing

<sup>2</sup> Arnold, *Hist. of Rome*, vol. i. p. 134.

and lending was among the Romans is shown by the stringency and even cruelty of the laws against insolvent debtors, the frequent occurrence of debt troubles quite apart from agrarian agitations, and the many attempts made, with little success, to prevent the rate of interest from rising too high. It is interesting to note this resemblance between the Romans and the Jews. Indeed, not only in the practice of usury did these two nations resemble one another, but the Romans at all times, according to their opportunities, at home and abroad, in ousting their weaker neighbours from their farms, and in extorting "benevolences" from provincial towns, exhibited a covetousness and an ingenuity, as well as ruthlessness of avarice, which any Hebrew might have envied. "A prominent feature," says Mr. Ihne, "in the Roman character was their intense love of gain. The highest as well as the lowest among them were greedy and avaricious. This passion blunted the feelings of kindness and sympathy for human suffering, and inspired those harsh, and even inhuman laws, which were intended to extort payment at almost any cost from insolvent or obstinate debtors."<sup>3</sup> At Rome, as in Palestine, the borrower who could not pay was made a bondsman to his creditor; but if the creditor did not wish to encumber himself with him, he might sell him as a slave, even into foreign lands, or put him to death as a malefactor; while if he were kept in the patrician mansion, there was no hope of release from servitude and blows until the debt was fully paid. But this question naturally arises: how in those days was there any class in a condition to lend upon a large scale? To answer it we have only to consider the character of the wealth of the patricians, which was such that they did not suffer proportionately with the small farmers in the destructive wars of that period. It is commonly said that Rome was not a commercial city; and there is some truth in the statement, inasmuch as commerce was always held second to agriculture, and was subjected to legal restrictions. But it is none the less true that the commerce of Rome, from the earliest times of which we have any knowledge, was considerable.

The town of Ostia, to us as old as Rome itself, was built by the Romans at the mouth of the Tiber for no other object than that it might be to them what Piræus was to the Athenians. Again, it is a significant fact that the earliest colonies of Roman citizens were founded on the coast of Latium and Campania,

<sup>3</sup> Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, vol. i. p. 323.

so that at first a *colonia civium Romanorum*, and a *colonia maritima*, were convertible terms. Evidently the coast was chosen as their site for the same reason that it was chosen for Ostia, that besides tilling the soil, the inhabitants might build ships and help the mother-city by foreign commerce. Thirdly, there was preserved in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus down to the latest times a document written upon tablets of bronze, purporting to be the very treaty which was struck with the great commercial city of Carthage in the first year of the Republic. To the later Romans its idiom was so archaic, that the most learned antiquarians could only decipher it with difficulty. It is mentioned by Livy, and by the most trustworthy of the historians of Rome, Polybius, who gives its substance in full. By this treaty the Romans were allowed to trade with Sardinia, Sicily, and the coast of Africa between Carthage itself and the pillars of Hercules. And, as Arnold says, it is much more according to the common course of things that this treaty should have been made to regulate a commerce already in activity, than to call it for the first time into existence. But undoubtedly the chief part of Roman trade was carried on with Sicily and the Greeks of Southern Italy.

Commerce then, next to agriculture, was a great source of wealth to those of the Romans who had capital with which to undertake it, and the medium of their trade was copper, a metal so plentiful at that time as to be found in large masses of ore on the surface of the soil. The enterprize and resources requisite for commerce were by no means confined to the patricians. There were capitalists among the plebeians also, who, according to the general run of self-made men, treated the poorer members of their own order with more hardness even than did the blue blood. Already the cavalry force of the Republic, to which wealthy plebeians as well as patricians belonged, was beginning to acquire the character of a moneyed aristocracy, a class which furnished the farmers of the public taxes, those "publicans," who enjoy an unenviable notoriety from the pages of Holy Writ, who accompanied the Roman Governor to his province, like a pack of jackals hungering after the scraps and bones which the lion will leave them. At this very time, when the great mass of the plebeian order was plunged in misery, more than four hundred plebeians were raised in one year from the infantry service to the cavalry. Thus the bold and unscrupulous enriched themselves by the sufferings of the timid or the conscientious.

From this digression on the sources and nature of Roman wealth we return to the history of Roman poverty. But here a second difficulty meets us. The Roman historians, in relating how the agricultural class suffered from the predatory warfare of the Volscians and Æquians, and how, in consequence, it fell into a state of indebtedness almost amounting to a national bankruptcy, speak only of the plebs in general, and do not tell us whether the distress especially affected the freehold farmers or the client farmers. Most modern writers seem to confine it to the freeholders, some—and among them Ihne—confine it to the clients. To me it seems that we have no reason for making such a distinction where our authorities make none. It is evident that a band of marauding enemies would not spare the farm of a Roman peasant because he was the client of a Valerius or an Horatius. And if a client might thus fall into the same straits as a freeholder, he would have the same inducement to borrow. It matters little whether the debts he incurred were direct loans of money, or food, or seed for replanting his fields, or whether they were arrears of rent, on which interest was charged as on so much money lent him by his patron. For we know the Romans too well to suppose that, except in rare individual cases, they would think of remitting to their clients a year's rent, or any other of those burdens to which they were liable. Nay, we see from the fate of Sp. Cassius and M. Manlius, that a patrician could not go a straighter road towards impeachment for treason against the Republic than by showing any kind of singularity in his treatment of the non-privileged classes.

Towards the independent small farmers the attitude of the patricians is still more easy to understand. Seeing that, above all other sources of wealth, an ample estate was always the horn of plenty to a Roman, what more natural than that they should wish to make their landed property as large as possible? What more natural than that it should find its way to the ear of some ruined peasant, that a rich neighbour is willing to buy his land of him for a handsome sum, and if he will sell it, even to allow him to remain on it as a tenant upon fair conditions? What a tempting bait for a poor man, struggling against adversity to support a wife and family! And if he refuses to take it and to part with his beloved plot of ground, the rich man has still another bait to make use of. Will he not receive a little money to set him upon his legs? Next year, with such bodily

strength as his and the help of such fine boys, he will be flourishing and prosperous once more, and then he may return the loan, with the addition of a paltry ten per cent. interest.<sup>4</sup> With more or less persuasion he consents to borrow; but fortune, perhaps, is still against him. When the year has passed, he is insolvent, and finds that, whereas before he would not sell his land, now he must give it up in payment of his debt, unless he wishes to forfeit his personal freedom, or, worse still, encumber himself more by borrowing again.

Thus, day by day, in the market-place of the city, or in one or other of the little villages studded over the Roman territory, the smitten people might be seen, discussing in groups with dismayed faces and angry mutterings the ruin of yet another honest and respected neighbour, the absorption of yet another freehold into the estate of some detested Claudius. An anecdote given by Livy<sup>5</sup> puts forcibly before us the condition of the plebs, and the resentment hardly subdued under which they chafed. It is, however, an extreme, perhaps exaggerated case: let us hope for the honour of the Romans that it was a rare one. As I cannot hope to rival Livy in the interest he puts into a story, I will translate his own words: "A war with the Volscians was impending, but the State, torn by factions, was in still greater danger from the feud between the nobles and the plebs, and the hatred provoked by the cruel treatment of debtors. The commons indignantly complained that though abroad they fought for the independence and supremacy of their country, at home they were imprisoned and oppressed by their own fellow-citizens; that the liberty of the people was safer in war than in peace, and in less danger in an enemy's country than in the city. The fire of their wrath, already kindled, was lighted into a blaze by one instance of signal misery. A man of advanced years rushed one day into the market-place, bearing upon him all the evidences of his misfortunes. His clothes were covered with filth, the appearance of his body more repulsive still from its wanness and emaciation, and his dishevelled hair and beard gave a savage expression to his face. He was recognized, nevertheless, in spite of his disfigurement. The bystanders exclaimed that he had held command as a

<sup>4</sup> Ten per cent. per annum was the maximum rate of interest fixed some fifty years later than the period of which I am speaking, in B.C. 450, by the laws of the Twelve Tables.

<sup>5</sup> Livy ii. 23.



centurion, and in tones of pity reminded one another of several military honours he had won. He, opening his tunic, displayed upon his breast the scarred witnesses of many an honourable fight; and when the crowd, which was fast increasing, assailed him with the questions, "Whence this sorry plight? whence this disfigurement?" he answered, that while he was serving in the Sabine war, the ravages of the enemy had destroyed his crops, his cottage had been burnt, his goods stolen, his cattle driven off, and finally, the war-tax levied upon him when he was in no condition to pay it; and so he had been driven to borrow. The debt, piled up with interest, had divested him, first of the land which he had inherited from his father and grandfather, then of the rest of his property, and lastly, like a disease, it had attacked his person. His creditor had dragged him off, not to make him work—he would have been thankful almost for that—but to a prison and to torture. And then he bared his back and showed it, lacerated with recent scourging. At this sight and at the sound of his words, the multitude raised a great shout, and a tumult arose, which was not confined to the market-place, but spread through the whole city."

Considering how necessary the prosperity of the farmers was, even for the defence of the State from foreign enemies, in those days when every freeman was a soldier, the folly of the patricians in driving the plebs to despair may well astonish us. But it is easy to be wise after the event. And we may consider besides how difficult it is to get any class of men to believe that another class is of greater importance in the community than themselves; how scarce a thing, in fact, is corporate humility, rarely to be found even in those bodies where individual pride is most rigorously suppressed.

But the patricians were soon to have a rude and most ignominious awakening from their dreams of perpetual sovereignty. In the autumn of B.C. 492, according to the common chronology, the war between the orders broke out; but the first manœuvre of the plebs was nothing more than a *reductio ad absurdum* of the favourite principle of their oppressors. The patricians arrogated to themselves as their exclusive right the title of *Populus Romanus*. We do not know who were the leaders of the commons in the insurrection, but it was certainly a brilliant idea to demonstrate to their adversaries the absurdity of their pretensions, by letting them feel for a time what it was like, actually to be the whole State. We can almost feel pity

when we imagine the dismay of the august senators when news was brought into the city that all the legions in the field had mutinied, deserted their commanders, and made a fortified camp on the banks of the Anio, and that all the peasantry from the country round was flocking to join them, leaving their farms and villages empty. In such a situation the patricians were utterly helpless. They were not powerful enough to march against the seceders and compel them to return; they would have great difficulty in defending themselves if they should be attacked by them; whereas if the intention of the plebs was to leave for ever their former homes and found a new city, as apparently it was, what would become of their fine estates and their crops? and would the patrician have to buy and sell his vegetables himself in the market-place? In fact, it was a very inconvenient state of things. A new and expressive word has lately been added to the English vocabulary; but we see that the manner of acting which it connotes was practised on this occasion by the Roman commons with great success. The quarrel was of course patched up for a time by a compromise, in which the Government made a concession which furnished the Opposition henceforth with official and recognized leaders. A new magistracy was to be appointed and called the Tribune of the Plebs, for the protection of the rights of the people. The tribunes, who at first were two in number, were to be equal in power to the consuls within the walls of the city and within their own sphere of duty; that is, when acting in defence of their order, they might stop with their veto any action of the consuls or of the Senate. I am not concerned with the Tribune of the Plebs, except inasmuch as it was the instrument by which those great social reforms which go by the name of the Agrarian Laws, were effected. To criticize this magistracy, to discuss the wisdom of those who projected and those who accepted it, and the causes of its abuse in later times, would carry me far beyond the limits of an article.

In accepting this settlement of the quarrel, the seceders showed that they were much more anxious to obtain equal justice for their order, the security of freeholders in their property, and the protection of tenants from exorbitant burdens, than to have any greater share than they already possessed in the Government. And yet we cannot doubt that many wealthy plebeians were in the camp on the Sacred Mount, many who had no personal grievances to complain of, but who still looked

upon the movement as useful to themselves in breaking down the proud exclusiveness of the privileged class. And thus the political malcontents, whose goal was the consulship, and the distressed farmers, whose only desire was to be able to live happy, acted this time in concert.

The immediate improvement made by this new office in the condition of the poor was not very apparent; in fact it does not seem to have been very great. It was not a remedy which struck at the root of the disease. The tribunes could only act in accordance with existing laws and customs; but to save the people, new legislation was imperatively demanded. Of what use was it to be able to stop a few or even many cases of oppression in which the oppressor violated the law, when the vast majority of cases were committed in the name of the law and with the help of its officers? For one family reduced to beggary by being forcibly ejected from its land by a powerful neighbour, there were a hundred others kept in a degraded state of hand-to-mouth living, because all the savings they could make went to pay the customary dues and reliefs of their patrons. Nor in fact can oppression and extortion in any sense, whether legal or illegal, be said to have been the principal cause of the misery of the plebs. The chief instrument of its degradation was not active injustice, fraud, or usury, but the passive selfishness of the aristocracy, who refused to admit the poor to those means of relief which the State had at its disposal and which it was the duty of the State to apply to their needs. In brief, the land system was at fault, and on a reform of the land system depended the preservation of the middle class. For as we have already seen, many families had been ruined and reduced to utter poverty during the last twenty years, and had either been obliged to sell their lands for want of the means to support themselves upon them, or had fallen victims to usury and lost them through becoming insolvent. Now for such families no new mode of support was easily to be found. The mechanical arts and retail trades were monopolized by the patricians: that is, the guilds of artisans which I have before enumerated were wholly composed of the city-clients, of whose professional gains the patrons always received a certain portion. Therefore every one desiring to take up some craft and enter some guild for the first time, could not do so without binding himself as client to a patrician—if even that was possible, and it is by no means certain that it was—

and probably not even then without the consent of the *gens* which was the patron of the guild as a whole. So that practically to an ordinary plebeian no occupation was open but agriculture. Public works on which the poor might be employed were not begun during the Republic on any large scale till the censorship of Appius Claudius Cæcus, who built the first great road and the first aqueduct. And so a family that had lost its land must of necessity become dependent upon some rich man, and that by a contract in which the rich man could of course fix his own conditions.

Now, however much it is conceivable that in another state of society such a system might not be attended with very bad consequences, at Rome its effect was most demoralizing to the plebs. The early Roman law, though enforcing stringently the observance of contracts, laid no restrictions on the making of contracts. It was not till many years later that the barbarous custom was forbidden, which till then had been common, and at this particular period was especially frequent, of pledging the ownership and liberty of one's own person, or the persons of one's own children, for the fulfilment of an obligation. We can then imagine the degrading effect upon the plebeian body of a large diminution in the number of freeholds, of their absorption into the estates of the nobility, and of their former owners being reduced to accept the patronage of the rich, to serve them and receive their protection, upon conditions wholly arbitrary and ever rising in severity with the number of the applicants. There ought to have been some means in the power of the State to preserve at least the number of freeholds substantially undiminished. And there was a means, both simple and effectual; but it was the interest of the patricians that it should not be employed. I need scarcely say that I allude to the distribution of land from the public domain. No one is ignorant that all the Greek and Roman communities separated from the rest of their territory a portion which should be the exclusive property of the State, remaining either as public pasture, or as leased land bringing revenue into the treasury; and that on the admission of new citizens, or the impoverishment of any great number of old ones, a distribution of the domain land was a universally recognized way of making the number of landed proprietors keep pace with the number of citizens. But at the time at which I am speaking, the whole of the State-domain of Rome, the *Ager publicus*, as it was

called, had been usurped by the patricians: not that they stole it for their private property, but they were tacitly permitted by the Government, *i.e.*, themselves, to occupy and cultivate as much common land as by private agreement among themselves, they might be able to enclose. Their tenure, however, of this land was an occupation merely, not an ownership, and the technical Latin term for it was *possessio*—just as we distinguish between possession and ownership in the proverb, “possession is nine parts of the law.” In token of this, the occupiers of the common land were bound to pay to the State a tithe or a fifth part of the produce. But occupation or ownership, what difference did the poor see between them? By both they were equally debarred from that assistance out of the domain, to which as having spent their toil, perhaps their blood, in defence of the commonwealth, they were justly entitled.

Amid the general selfishness and narrowness of mind displayed by the patricians, it is pleasant to find that from their ranks came forward some of the warmest defenders of the people, men of large and enlightened views, who, indignant at the tyranny of the body to whom it was their misfortune to belong, used the advantages which God gave them in the service of the noblest and most important part of the community. Spurius Cassius in his third consulship was the foremost man in Rome. He had, by renewing the league with the Latins in his first consulship, done more to strengthen her position and secure her safety than any other that we read of since the fall of Tarquin. He had been a leading man ten years before, during the secession of the plebs to the Sacred Hill, and no doubt had had a large share in settling that quarrel amicably. He now came forward with a proposal, which he intended to submit in the form of a Bill to the Supreme Assembly, for a distribution of State land to the suffering commons. It appears from the accounts of our authorities, which, however, are both scanty and contradictory, that this Bill did not propose to take from the patricians any part of the domain which they had long occupied, but to save from occupation and assign as freeholds to the necessitous certain lands which had been newly annexed to the domain, Livy says which had been taken from the Hernici. With the consul to propose it, and the enthusiasm of the plebs to support it, the Bill could not but pass; for the patricians could only secure

a majority in the *Comitia Centuriata* upon ordinary occasions, when there was no especial cause of excitement to bring the people in great numbers to the Assembly from their country-homes. Nor would the patricians wish to oppose the Bill very stoutly. It was a more effectual mode of proceeding to allow it to pass, and having pacified the people by a seeming compliance, to destroy their leader, and let the matter quietly drop.

This they did, though in what manner is not known, for there are so many conflicting accounts. Some said, as Livy tells us, that Cassius was accused of committing high treason by aiming at royal power, and that the poor-spirited people allowed their champion to be convicted and executed, as in a similar manner their cowardice permitted the murder of Manlius and the Gracchi. Others said that he was slain by his own father in virtue of the *Patria Potestas*. But the patricians were much mistaken if they hoped that with the life of Spurius Cassius they had quenched the agitation which he started. For three years, indeed, the people were completely cowed, and the nobles, determined not to have again such a consul as Spurius Cassius, for three years elected the consuls by themselves without summoning the General Assembly. At last the tribunes of the plebs came forward in a manner worthy of their position as the protectors of the poor. When the consuls Lucius Furius and Caius Manlius appeared at the end of their year of office to render to the people an account of their actions, the tribunes converted what was usually a matter of form into an opportunity for asserting the power of their office. When the consuls were about to retire, having lauded themselves in the boastful language proper to the occasion, one of the tribunes, Cneius Genucius, stepped forward, and impeached them for the neglect of their duty.<sup>6</sup> They were summoned to appear for trial before the *Comitia* on a fixed day, and the specific charge laid against them was that they had neglected to enforce the agrarian law of Cassius. This bold proceeding rekindled the passions of both sides. On the one hand the commonalty were filled with sanguine hopes by the audacity of their leader; while the nobles clearly showed their own sense of the badness of their cause, by the manner in which they defended it. One morning, before the trial came on, Genucius was found murdered in his house.

This was the second holocaust offered at Rome on the altar

<sup>6</sup> The expression used by Livy is *arripuit*—he “plucked” them.



of freedom ; but every fresh outrage only weakened the cause of the perpetrators. The murder of a leading plebeian might leave the commons bewildered and without guidance, but as soon as another was found brave enough to lead them, they renewed the combat with greater determination than before. But soon another cry was added to that of the oppressed peasants. It was the cry of the whole plebeian body, rich and poor alike, for a written code of laws, the only guarantee of equal justice. Considering the fairness, and to our notions, the utter harmlessness to any party, of this demand, the fierceness and pertinacity with which patricians opposed it are quite amazing. For more than twelve years the contest lasted ; during which period the state of Rome resembled that of Florence in the fourteenth century, when pitched battles were fought in the streets between the nobles and plebeians.

The patricians adopted a regular organization for the defence of their privileges. Clubs were formed, the members of which, daring and active young men, skilled in the use of weapons, and not least of the dagger, now acting openly in bodies kept the people from assembling in the Forum, now by secret assassination tried to terrify them and break their spirit.<sup>7</sup> After twelve years of unceasing conflict the commons carried their point ; the Decemviri Legibus Scribendis were appointed, and in B.C. 450, the foundations of the magnificent edifice of Roman law were securely laid.

On this point, then, agitation succeeded perfectly ; in the matter of the agrarian law its success was only partial. Four years before the Twelve Tables were extorted from the patricians, the poor obtained an instalment of what Sp. Cassius had wished to give them entire. A tribune, L. Icilius by name, succeeded in carrying the famous law *de Aventino publicando*, which, though only an instalment of Cassius' law, was looked upon by the people as the beginning of their deliverance, and held by them in eternal veneration as one of the *Leges Sacratæ* not to be broken without sacrilege. Nor will the importance of it be easily over-estimated ; for besides fully granting the principle on which the agrarian laws were based, it enabled the plebeian freeholders, the Roman middle-class, to obtain for the first time a footing in the city. Up to that time all the land in

<sup>7</sup> At the head of the rioters for a long time was the son of that most bigoted of aristocrats, Cincinnatus. At last the young coxcomb was brought to trial by the tribunes and sentenced to a well-deserved exile.

the city, being part of the *Priscus ager Romanus*, had been in the hands of the patricians. Not that it was all their private property ; but what was not owned by individuals among them was the property of the State. This, of course, had been occupied and enjoyed by patrician families in the usual way for many years : probably it was the first part of the domain that was so occupied. So that as yet, with the exception, perhaps, of a few, wealthy enough to buy land in the city at the high price the patricians would be certain to put on it, no plebeians had landed property within the walls of the town. The law, then, *de Aventino publicando*, deprived the patricians of the enjoyment of all the common land within the walls, and divided it among the plebeians, especially those who were in want, to be their property for ever. The quarter where this land lay was the Aventine hill, which henceforth became the plebeian quarter of the town. It must be borne in mind that such of the common land occupied by the nobility as was cultivated, would be held in sub-tenancy by their clients and cultivated by them. Now when the land was taken away from the occupiers, these tenants would of course have a prior right in the assignation that ensued, and, in the ordinary course of things, would keep their former holdings in proprietorship. And here we see another great service done to Rome by the agrarian laws, besides the relief of poverty and distress, namely, the gradual abolition of the old clientela, a rotten system of serfage, only by a legal fiction based upon contract, and therefore unworthy of citizens. The rich occupiers of the Aventine, Dionysius tells us, were not dispossessed without compensation, except such as had occupied it by force or fraud ; the rest were repaid for the money they might have laid out in building or other improvements, at a fair estimate to be fixed by arbitration. Having obtained this important grant, the commons instantly began to take possession of it, and the space not sufficing to give all who claimed their share a separate plot of ground, an allotment was given to two, three, or more persons together, who then built upon it a house with as many flats or stories as their number required, each man having one floor for himself and family as his freehold, and a share in the plot of ground on which the house stood.

The effect of the Icilian reform and of the Decemviral legislation which followed four years after, was most salutary, and almost immediately apparent. The commons had not struggled

in vain: though the Twelve Tables confirmed the severity of the debtor laws and several humiliating distinctions between patrician and plebeian, Rome was beginning to assume the appearance of a united people, prospering in all the arts of peace and war. From having been hitherto on the defensive, holding their own with difficulty against the neighbouring tribes, we now find the Romans becoming the aggressors, carrying their arms successfully against Etruscan, Hernican, Sabine, Æquian, and Volscian, and launching out on that career of conquest which even the terrible reverse of the Gallic invasion could only check for a moment. With the increase of their territory, which kept pace with the success of their arms, a new species of agrarian agitation arose—an agitation not to deprive the patricians of the State land which they occupied, but to prevent the newly-conquered territory from becoming State land, and to have it distributed to the people before it could fall under the pernicious system of occupation. Such were the agitations which we read of at various times, for sending out colonies of poor citizens to newly-captured towns.

And here the commons were aided against the more selfish part of the nobility by the State-policy of the Senate, which clearly saw the advantage of such colonies, both as drawing off superfluous population, and as affording a strong protection to the Roman territory. Thus, beginning with Lavici, near Tusculum, to which a colony of fifteen hundred citizens was sent, Rome gradually drew around her a strong belt of forts and outposts, never completely closed up, because it was continually found necessary to encompass with it a wider dominion. These colonies were the salvation of Rome during the invasion of Hannibal, not one deserting her even in her darkest hour. But there was nearly always a section of the nobility found to oppose the sending out of a colony; for, besides depriving them of the opportunity of occupying for their own benefit the land confiscated from the enemy, colonization was a chief instrument in the gradual emancipation of the clients from their vassalage. Speaking of the clientela, Mommsen says: "The agricultural and unpropertied tenants-at-will furnished the genuine material for the Roman policy of colonization, without which it never would have succeeded; for while the State may give land to those who have none, it cannot impart to those who know nothing of agriculture the spirit and the energy to wield the plough."

For many years Rome was involved in a deadly struggle with Veii, the most powerful city in Etruria, much finer than Rome itself, and with a larger territory. It was, however, the struggle between a new State and a worn out one, between a growing and a decayed civilization. Veii fell, and the Roman territory at a single stroke was more than doubled. The subjects of Veii became now the subjects, many of them citizens, of Rome, but a large part of their land was confiscated, and of course disputes arose about its distribution. Into these disputes I will not enter, as they do not involve the real principle of the agrarian laws. They rather remind us of the snarling fights of wolves over their prey, and it is with difficulty we can bring ourselves to sympathize even with the weaker ones of the ravenous flock, huddled out of the way by the stronger.

Never did the march of Roman power receive so terrible a check as now fell upon it, a year or two after the fall of Veii. The Gauls! the very name was sufficient to freeze the blood in a Roman's veins. The domesticated Anglo-Saxon did not fear the Danes more than the most martial people of antiquity feared those gigantic barbarians. It was not till the victories of Cæsar that this dread of the Gauls began to be dispelled. The sack and conflagration of the city by the hosts of Brennus in B.C. 390, though it did not much alter her position among the surrounding nations, which suffered as much as she did, threw back the internal condition of the Roman people nearly a hundred years. For it is now a hundred years since the first secession of the plebs, and we find among the people now the same misery almost as led to that event. The same activity of the usurers, the same overwhelming load of debt incurred by the poor, the same or even greater disparity of fortunes, for while the prisons of the nobility were filled with debtors, we read that estates of more than five hundred acres were by no means unusual. Manlius, the saviour of the Capitol from the Gauls, maintained at his trial that he had relieved or saved from bondage four hundred insolvent debtors. His generosity did not save him from death. On the contrary, his fellow patricians argued from it that he was aiming at kingly power, and such a cry had as powerful an effect upon the whole Roman people as the cry of "Papal encroachment" has upon the British public. That boast of Manlius may have been an exaggeration, but certainly remedial legislation was never more required than at this time. The scheme of legislation which was actually brought forward was

typical of the agrarian laws in general. Caius Licinius Stolo, when he entered on the tribuneship, drew up a Bill, to which he obtained the assent of his colleagues, which enacted: (1) that no one should have in occupation more than three hundred acres of the public domain; (2) that all the rest of the domain should be divided among the plebeians, or at least the greater part, some perhaps being left undivided for purposes of revenue. To this was added a still stronger measure in favour of debtors, viz., that all the interest that had been paid upon debts then existing should be deducted from the capital, and the remainder of the debt paid without interest. The maximum of three hundred acres shows a very large increase of the Roman territory from its original small beginnings.

These popular demands met, as was natural, with the most determined resistance. Not to speak of the reduction of debts, the "possessions" of the aristocracy in the domain had assumed far more the appearance of property than they had when Cassius, ninety years before, had tried to take them from the occupiers. For as long as the State did not disturb the occupier in the usufruct of its land, that usufruct had many of the appearances of real property. It might be left to the occupier's heirs by will; it might be bought or sold, or shared with others, without any direct communication with the real owner—the State. And thus large estates of domain land must have passed from father to son for many generations, till the fact that they were not private property, nor fiefs granted in perpetuity, was almost forgotten. Much more was this the case when, two hundred and thirty years later, Tib. Gracchus tried to revive the agrarian law of Licinius Stolo, which had fallen into desuetude, and to confiscate all common land occupied above the legal maximum. We cannot wonder, then, that the occupiers considered these attempts at land reform as invasions of the rights of property, and that the Gracchi, as well as Sp. Cassius, were thought even by the most upright of the nobility, Cicero for example, to have been justly put to death. But the most learned Roman jurists always allowed that abstract right was on the side of the commons; because it was a principle of Roman law that prescriptive rights could not be acquired against the State, and that no length of time could transform occupation of State land into proprietorship.

If, then, abstract justice was on the side of the people, and want and misery were also on their side, it would be a bold

thing indeed to say that equity was not. And certainly, if prescriptive rights could be gained by a privileged few, to the detriment of a large and important class in the community, it would be difficult to justify either the emancipation of the negroes in Jamaica, or the abolition of rotten boroughs by the Parliamentary Reform Bill. The social reform of Licinius was only carried by a combination of all parties among the plebeians. The farmers agreed to support the plebeian aristocracy in claiming a share in the consulship, and an addition to that effect was made to the Licinian Rogations, upon which condition the plebeian aristocracy cooperated with the leaders of the lower orders to carry out those measures which were considered necessary to preserve and foster the independent peasantry. This contest was said to have lasted ten years, which Ihne, by the stern rules of his infallible criticism, cuts down to five, at the same time rejecting the story that for several years together the tribunes prevented the election of the ordinary magistrates. But, at any rate, the power of the *veto*, and the right of haranguing the people in the democratic assembly of the tribes—in other words, obstruction and agitation—were the two, all but omnipotent, arms of the popular leaders. At last moderate and prudent counsels prevailed in the Senate. The approbation of that body was given to the measures of Licinius, and in B.C. 366 they passed in due form through the Comitia and became law.

The effect of the social reform thus carried has generally been underrated, chiefly because, two hundred and thirty years later, we find that still greater internal disorders existed, and that the Licinian laws were no longer observed. But we also find, during the years which followed B.C. 366, several instances of prosecutions and heavy fines inflicted on those who had tried to occupy more than three hundred acres of the domain, which shows that the legal maximum was for some time kept with tolerable strictness. In a similar way we are apt to consider the career of Tiberius Gracchus a failure, on account of his violent death, although by his agrarian law at least 35,000 farms were portioned out from the domain to poor Roman citizens:<sup>8</sup> 35,000 families provided with an honest livelihood!

<sup>8</sup> Mommsen, vol. iii. p. 102: he shows from the census that between B.C. 131 and B.C. 125 the number of citizens capable of bearing arms was increased by 76,000; and on an average a family would not have more than two members fit for military service; especially as the exposure of infants was commonly practised at Rome, to keep within limits the number of heirs.



From this time, then, for more than two centuries, we hear nothing more of agrarian agitations, with the exception of a few squabbles over newly annexed land, which are rather signs of prosperity and increase than of the antipathy of landowner and peasant. I have chosen to relate the early history of the agrarian laws rather than that of the later period—seeing that to do both was impossible—for three reasons: (1) Because the agrarian laws of the Gracchi and other social reformers, differed in no very important point from those of Cassius, Icilius, and Stolo: such was the poverty of invention in Roman statesmanship. (2) Because the earlier attempts to reform the land system were blest with a certain measure of success, while, in the later period of the Republic, the internal economy of the State was so utterly degraded that the mere re-enactment of worn out measures, whatever degree of temporary relief might be afforded, could not possibly stem the tide of revolution. (3) I consider the early history of Rome especially instructive, as furnishing examples of what would now I am afraid be stigmatised as revolutionary measures, such as the general reduction or even cancelling of debts in times of excessive suffering among the poor, which were so far from “dismembering the State” or “shaking the foundations of society,” that, on the contrary, they consolidated its unity, by equalizing to some extent the various factors of human happiness, which are ever tending to such wide inequality.

If anything could teach wisdom to an aristocracy in their dealing with the masses, assuredly the Roman nobles would have learnt a salutary lesson from the warnings they received in these early troubles of the power of the people and the danger of grinding them down. And yet, when the blaze and glare of foreign conquest has somewhat abated, and we are able to look again with steady eyes at the mistress of the world herself, we see not the majestic and beautiful thing we should have expected to find, but a repulsive leper, almost a corpse. “The progress of luxury, and the accumulation into a few hands of the wealth of States and Empires, have completed the transformation of the free peasants of Rome into a herd of paupers, domineered over, or still worse cajoled by, a knot of rival tyrants.”<sup>9</sup> All those germs of dissolution which had existed in the State from the beginning appear now fully developed: that disparity of fortunes, that smouldering

<sup>9</sup> Merivale, *Fall of Roman Republic*, p. 361.

hatred between classes, that gulf between the rich and the poor, which is the sure prognostic, because it is the cause, of a terrible revolution. But the true aristocrat is not afraid of this gulf yawning between himself and the great mass of his fellow-citizens. He is not disturbed by it; on the contrary, he is proud of it, and looks upon it as the safeguard of his position. The French seigneurs never felt themselves so secure in their despotism as when they had the people reduced just to that degree of misery which they could no longer endure. Dean Merivale calls the Roman oligarchy the most frightful instrument of human suffering ever inflicted upon the world; but, without letting our eloquence carry us into superlatives, when we see such men as Tib. and C. Gracchus, Livius Drusus, and Sulpicius stricken down by the class whose real interests they were consulting while they tried to curb its tyranny, we cannot be sorry to see it at last overwhelmed under the massacres of Marius, the proscriptions of Octavius and Antonius, and the despotism of the Emperor Tiberius.

ROBERT BEAUCLERK.

*Passages from the Life of a Yorkshire Lady.*

---

PART THE SECOND.

---

CHAPTER XII.

THE FIRST HOUSE IN LONDON.

WINEFRID WIGMORE is entirely silent concerning Mary Ward's second journey to England. It may be that she did not accompany her on that occasion, and therefore dilates on the third and others when she seems to have been present. It is from one of Mary Ward's conferences with her companions at St. Omer, when about, perhaps, to select further workers for England before her own departure there at some later date, that we are able to fix the part of London where the English Virgins had been already living for some time in 1613. She relates an anecdote which refers without doubt, though she does not give her name, to Doña Luisa de Carvajal, whose interesting and remarkable life has been for some years published in English.<sup>1</sup> Mary says:

You may judge, my Sisters, who live in a Catholic country, what great virtue they must have who are persecuted by these heretics in an unbelieving land. Such a thing has never before been heard or seen, that people have been persecuted and imprisoned, only because they were suspected of being associated with us and of living with us. You must bear in mind how necessary humility, confidence in God, patience, generosity, and all other virtues are in such circumstances. On St. Luke's day (Old Style) in the year 1613, there happened what I am about to relate. A Spanish lady of noble birth, and who was still more noble from her fervent desire to suffer persecution for Christ's sake, when she heard of the present great persecution, had an ardent thirst for martyrdom. For this reason she left her usual dwelling and her friends, and came into our neighbourhood, where she lived a very secluded and virtuous life, having with her four noble ladies of our

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Doña Luisa de Carvajal*, by Lady G. Fullerton. Quarterly Series. Doña Luisa was a Spanish lady of high birth, who, attracted by an ardent desire to aid the persecuted English Catholics, and attain herself to the crown of martyrdom, came to live in England in 1605.

nation. The constables and officials came on St. Luke's day to the house of this lady, broke into it, and found the lady praying with her companions. One of them, however, lay dangerously ill of small-pox, and another was nursing her. They came into the room of the sick lady, who within twenty-four hours afterwards died of fright, deprived of all the holy sacraments of the Catholic Church.

The Spanish Ambassador (Count de Gondomar) received early intelligence of the matter, and failed not to come, and desired to know the cause of such unheard-of cruelty. But they showed him the order of the Parliament, with the information that they must carry away the lady and her companions. Their weakness and inability were pleaded, upon which a great lord offered his coach, and it was accepted. The Spanish lady, with one of her companions, was seated in one coach, the other two in another; the sick lady meantime was left alone, and died in the hands of the heretics. The windows of these coaches were kept open, and thus they were conducted a long distance through the public streets, the people thronging round calling out, "English nuns, English nuns!" When they arrived at the residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, he asked what it was? The official replied, that he had brought the Spanish lady. The Archbishop immediately ordered her to be taken to the Gatehouse, and put into the worst prison. Then he began to question and examine her companions, whom he had kept by themselves. "Whence is it," he said, "that you are in such black dresses, with veil and wimple? You have certainly been at one time at St. Omer." Upon this he called them sisters, or nuns, and caused them to be written down as nuns, for examination before a judge. At last he ordered them to be taken to prison, and to be put near the lady. The next day the Spanish Ambassador came before the Council, and asked that he should be allowed to speak. He pleaded with such effect for them, that he brought the whole Council to his side, except the Archbishop of Canterbury, who said that she was an alluring, prating woman; she sought out young girls in England, and sent them over to the nuns at St. Omer, from whence they came back afterwards and carried on their nun's work in England.

You may now yourselves judge what sort of a virtue those must have who are to be sent to England. And certainly, as long as I shall live, none shall come over to me who are not of well-tried piety, and without the smallest fault or defect, for this would afterwards be injurious to the Institute. So also none shall be received in England who are not really fit to live a spiritual life, and who have not, at the same time, been well tried whether they have the true spirit of our calling. They may indeed follow it for themselves, but not be sent over to these, if they are not of well-known virtue, and have given some good proof of it.

Mary's words give a lively idea of what she and her companions were liable to, and show that their work in London

was already sufficient to attract the notice of the chief authorities. The account tallies with that given in Doña Luisa's Life by her Spanish biographer Luis Munoz. Mary makes a few additions, which she must have heard from her friends, who doubtless had been alarmed by Dr. Abbott, the Protestant Archbishop, a fierce persecutor of the Catholics, confusing, as he evidently did at the time, the Spanish lady with Mary Ward. His narrow soul could not grasp the idea that there could be two heroic women, likeminded in this, that they were ready to throw away their lives and all they had to win souls back to the true faith. But we shall see by-and-bye that he found out his mistake as to Mary Ward. The house whence Doña Luisa was forcibly taken to prison, and where she had lived for two years, was in Spitalfields. It was in that neighbourhood, then, and for more than two years, that Mary and her companions had established themselves, making the date of their first settlement in England somewhere in the year 1611. They probably chose it as a quiet vicinity, Spitalfields being but a suburb, on an ascent out of London, in those days; the houses with gardens round them and fields and woods close by, as even the name shows. Wealthy people had their country houses there. It afforded also some protection to Catholics from the residences of the Flemish and Venetian Ambassadors being near at hand; and there was a still more important reason for Mary's choice, in that Mass was daily celebrated in the chapels of the Embassies, and the Blessed Sacrament had then lately begun to be reserved there. Such near neighbours, at a dangerous time, and fellow-worshippers day after day before the same altar, with so many mutual friends and kindred points of character, above all, with a common cause, and such a cause, at their hearts, it is impossible not to believe that Mary Ward and Doña Luisa knew one another. But the life of the heroic Spaniard was drawing to a close, and when Mary returned to England in 1614, she was already dead.

Winefrid Wigmore thus describes how Mary was occupied during this third visit. "When once arrived there, her health was one of her last cares," although she was sent to her native country for its re-establishment. "Occasions presented for the service of God and good of her neighbour: she refused none, neither could any want what was in her power, were it spiritual or corporal; neither did she dispute why this or that person, or this or that place; her only why and what was that God's

honour were advanced and souls gained to Him, which was cause she assisted so many towards their being religious, as herself did not so much as know the persons, when by occasion of seeing her, they acknowledged the grace of being religious to have come by her means. [She was] laden with these holy labours, so as to have scarce time to eat or sleep." There was another matter which also occupied Mary on this visit, namely, the removal of her mother and youngest sister, Elisabeth Ward, from England, to live at St. Omer with her. There are no details remaining on this matter, but failing these, it may be conjectured that her father's (Marmaduke Ward) death opened the way for this arrangement. Both her father and mother died before the year 1619; for Barbara Ward at that date says, speaking of others who had suffered much for the Catholic faith: "So likewise had her own parents, of whom we will speak hereafter more at large, their sufferings were many, lives very holy, and deaths happy." Elisabeth Ward finally joined the Institute, but very little is on record concerning her beyond the occasional mention of her name.

Mary's eldest brother was already dead. Winefrid Wigmore, in writing of her great grace of conformity to the will of God, says: "She began this practice while yet young, upon the death of her eldest brother, who was killed in duel (but so as to have the sacraments, and died Christian-like), and was to her the dearest of all her brothers and sisters, and most like and sympathizing with her. Yet had not this accident the least power as to make a breach in this union of her will with God's, or change the serenity of her mind or countenance. Hearing that her younger brother should say he hoped to live to revenge his brother's death, though as asleep to the former, made it then appear how active she was to prevent the offence of God, found efficacy so to labour and without cease till she brought him over where he might be applied to his studies and learn to make use of his courage." There is no date to either of these occurrences, but as Winefrid seems to have been an eye-witness of Mary Ward's outward composure and self-command, it may be concluded that they happened after the year 1609. Mary's younger brother George, who is probably here intended, studied at the Seminary of St. Omer, and entered the Society of Jesus in 1619, in which he had the *alias* of Ingleby. He was for some time at Liège, and was for many years on the



English Mission, so that Mary must frequently have had intercourse with him.<sup>2</sup>

The time which Mary Ward passed in England on this occasion appears to have been longer than on any of her other visits, for her increasing occupations abroad at a later date necessitated her frequent presence there. It is not certain that the little community were still in the house at Spitalfields. We hear at another period of their having to move more than once, to avoid discovery. They had soon become objects of suspicion, and consequently subject to pursuivants' visits, and when once this was an established fact, the length of stay in the same house would have to be very uncertain. Nor is this to be wondered at when we read, in Winefrid Wigmore's manuscript, what were the employments of the household and who were their guests. She tells first how holy and regular they were in their observances, and how well ordered in temporal matters, and says that Mary "finding it much to God's service to have a residence for ours there, which she did, her family living so religiously, as the perfecter sort avouched they found the same as in their own colleges and houses in Catholic countries. The bountifulness and largeness of her heart was so well tempered and conjoined with her religious poverty, as a certain very knowing and curious person, after a long observance and exact observation of the government of her house, made this expression: 'There was none wanted, nor anything wasted, no, not so much as a piece of bread,' and that 'the comportment of hers to one another was like most dear and discreet friends that had been long absent and did then meet.'

"Her respect to priests was such as served the less perfect to enter into consideration of the dignity of their character. No doubt but her devotion was to some more than others, but her chief in all was that high state of priesthood, and, in consideration of that, all were by her highly esteemed, and she took it for an honour to receive them in her house. She kept con-

<sup>2</sup> In the Diary of the English College, Rome, there is a William Ward named who also adopted the *alias* of Ingleby, and who had studied at St. Omer's, but Winefrid's words lead to the supposition that Mary had only two brothers. A manuscript of the date of 1623 speaks of her "own brother, now called Mr. Ingleby," as having been with her in London during the years preceding 1618, when William Ward was at Rome, by the entry in the above Diary. The latter was more likely a cousin of Mary's, as there were several branches of the Ward family in Yorkshire. Those of Bishop's Middleham, Durham, descendants of one of Sir Christopher Ward's brothers, became Protestants, and one of them was chaplain to James the First, and afterwards Master of Sidney College, Cambridge.

stantly two in her house, to the end her family might not want due assistance, and the other be free to help such as should need abroad, especially the poor, to whom priests could not get but with great danger and by night, not having justifiable pretexts, as to those of quality they have, their houses being frequented by all sorts.

"To remedy this want, our dearest Mother employed herself and hers, sometimes disguised, and sometimes in her own clothes, using sometimes familiar conversation, other times authority amongst the common and poor sort, would first put them in doubt of their own error, and then lay the light before them. When it took, they instructed them how to make good confessions, and so prepared them, as the priests had but to hear their confessions, and so avoid the danger which a long stay would have brought them, and they also have more time to employ in such functions as alone belonged to their character. God so blessed these her endeavours, as many, and persons of note, both for the quality of their birth and malice and perverseness of their heresy, were converted."

In 1612, two secular priests and a Benedictine Father suffered at Tyburn. Their heads and members were, as usual, exposed on London Bridge and various conspicuous places of the city, and the ghastly sight must often have met the eyes of Mary and her friends as they made their way to the prisons or the houses of the poor. They were perhaps three out of the number of those priests who had found a safe asylum temporarily in their house, and whose labours they aided. Father Adam Contzen, of the Society of Jesus, Rector of the House at Munich, writing of Mary Ward's life at this period, says in a commendatory letter, "she sheltered and supported our Fathers in England." There were several of these Fathers at this time on the English Mission in London, among them Father Michael Walpole, brother of the martyr Father Henry Walpole, and Father Richard Blount, whose wonderful escapes from the pursuivants are well known. It is likely also that Mary Ward would renew her intercourse with Father Holtby, her early friend. The London prisons too were full of priests who, aided by the lax condition of prison discipline in this respect, held constant intercourse with the Catholics outside, and carried on their work of administering the sacraments and reconciling those to the Church who were brought to them by the zeal of others, within the walls of the Clink, the Counter, and the other

miserable receptacles for State criminals of that time. Of Mary's six companions, the first who were allowed to adventure themselves upon their hazardous calling in England, the name of only one is recorded. This is Susanna Rookwood. Of her it is told in the necrological account of many of the early members of the Institute, written in old French,<sup>3</sup> that "she was very often in danger of her life for the Catholic faith, to which she brought back a large number of souls, and preserved and strengthened many others. She was five times in prison for her religion, where she encouraged and refreshed the other prisoners both by spiritual and temporal means. At last she was thrown into a horrible dungeon, or rather hole, where she had to defend and preserve herself with a stick from the mice, rats, and other vermin which infested it. Here she had to remain for a considerable time, but was at last set free." She was not discouraged by these sufferings, but continued in England working in the Institute for many years.

From Father Lee's addresses it appears that the labours and holy life of Mary Ward and her companions were justly appreciated in England at this time. He says in one of them during her absence: "Your Superior is very well, thanks be to God, and hath found better friends than she did expect, and your course and manner of living marvellously well liked of and much commended."<sup>4</sup> He then adds his own opinion on these points: "Thus you may see, that though God permit you some afflictions, yet He will have some to approve it; therefore, children, have confidence in God, for I hope your estate will continue till the Day of Judgment, and that many thousands will profit by you."

While Mary Ward was thus fully occupied in England in the years 1614 and 1615, Father Roger Lee left St. Omer for Brussels and Louvain. But he did not give up his watchful care over the young community. Their proceedings seem to have been reported to him, and two long letters to them from Louvain<sup>5</sup> were written by him on occasion of some troubles, both exterior and interior, which had arisen. The first, dated May 2, 1615, and headed, "A letter of Rev. Father Lee's to our Sisters and Novices," seems to have been directed to strengthen

<sup>3</sup> Nymphenburg Manuscripts, called "Abrégé ou petit recueil de la sainte conversation de la vie, et de l'heureux décès de ce monde des Dames de l'Institut de Marie."

<sup>4</sup> Nymphenburg Manuscripts.

<sup>5</sup> Nymphenburg Manuscripts.

the latter against the attempts of their relations to draw them back into the world. He again praises the way of life they were pursuing, and says, "Your security is to do the will of your Heavenly Father, and persist immoveable in the happy course He hath called you unto, which assure yourselves is so much the happier for you, in regard you have the true practice of the essential virtues which make you truly religious before God, and only wants the external denomination, which doth but add an external glory and name unto it."

In the letter of June 24, 1615, called "A letter of Rev. Father Lee's to the Company," he gives them advice on the right use of the sacraments, in which some of them had needed counsel, and speaks of some fresh troubles and opposition which had arisen against them. Of the part he himself had already taken in settling and advancing them in their new vocation, he writes thus: "And as your course is not yet fully published to the world, so I thought it necessary, whilst I was with you, to endeavour to settle you in one same spirit and course of proceeding, so as if either death or other occasions should take me from you, you, still persisting in the same, might proceed with daily profit and increase of perfection." With regard to the advice he then gives, he cautions them against what he calls "two little domestical pickthanks," namely, scruples of conscience and want of submission to those who had to direct them, and adds, "And therefore, as far as my authority may sway with you, I command and request you in the boiling Blood of our Blessed Saviour, that you be careful on this point." Both letters are written in the old-fashioned and lengthy phraseology of that time, and show well Father Lee's undiminished interest in the well-being of the growing community.

---

### CHAPTER XIII.

#### A JUST SOUL.

MARY WARD came back from England in a very frail state of health. The date of her return to St. Omer may, perhaps pretty accurately be fixed, as shortly before a conversation which she had with Anna Gage, whom she was sending to fill the arduous post of Superior over the rest who were on the English Mission. Anna Gage started for England October 5, 1615, and the notes still exist of the advice which she received

from Mary before her departure. Mary herself was at that time requiring rest and refreshment, both for soul and body, but her energetic will remained unchanged. Fresh and important work was awaiting her on her arrival at St. Omer, and to prepare herself the better for it, she determined on making an eight days' retreat before involving herself in it. There is a short account of this retreat, in her own hand,<sup>1</sup> a fragment only written on a loose page, among her Meditations:

I. H. S.

Some eight days before All Saints, 1615, I wrote to my confessor, for he was then weak and ill, my desires to make those eight days some recollection, begging he would, &c., and to hear my half-year's confession when the time came, if his health would permit him. He condescended to both. My health was at that time very bad, and my cares many, the Institute upon drawing, and to be presently despatched to Rome; yet notwithstanding this, I felt in myself such ability and force to rise early to make my hours of prayer, or do whatsoever else requisite or might be helping to my more perfect union with God, whereunto it seems our Lord God invited me, affording the means, and making that which was heavy at other time at this to be no whit burdensome unto me. Yet His goodness only knows how negligently I spent the first four or five days. I made my confession, and after purposed to be more recollected and diligent those two days, having received upon the eve of All Saints.

It was upon one of these last two days of the retreat which Mary mentions that the occurrence took place upon which the inscription of the twenty-fifth picture of the Painted Life throws some light. The words are as follows: "God showed to Mary at St. Omer at the feast of All Saints, 1615, a just soul, in an unspeakable beauty, in which all the virtues appeared to be as in a tissue, through which it was not only alienated from all things earthly, perfectly stripped of itself, and wholly united to God, but it received also true liberty of spirit, equanimity, heavenly wisdom, and capacity for all which the perfection of the Institute required."

Her own account of what she saw in this vision is contained in a letter to Father Lee, which she sent him on All Saints' Day, and which remains still in her own handwriting.<sup>2</sup> The letter appears to have been the second which she addressed to him on the subject, the first not having been sufficiently explicit.

<sup>1</sup> Nymphenburg Manuscripts.

<sup>2</sup> Nymphenburg Manuscripts.

I. H. S.

Dearest Father,—I would exceedingly gladly, both for my better satisfaction and greater security, acquaint you with what hath occurred in these two days, especially that which yesterday I wrote to your Reverence about, and now going to set it down, the better I discern it, the less able I find myself to declare it. I seem to love it, and yet am afflicted in it, because I cannot choose but retain it, and yet dare not embrace it for truly good till it be approved. It seems a certain clear and perfect estate, to be had in this life, and such an one as is altogether needful for those that should well discharge the duties of this Institute. I never read of any I can compare in likeness to it. It is not like the state of saints, whose holiness chiefly appears in that union with God which maketh them out of themselves; I perceived then an apparent difference, and yet feel myself drawn to love and desire this estate more than all those favours. The felicity of this course (forasmuch as I can express) was a singular freedom from all that could make one adhere to earthly things, with an entire application and apt disposition to all good works. Something happened also discovering the freedom that such a soul should have had to refer all to God, but I think that was after, or upon some other occasion; howsoever, that such a thing there was I am very certain, I seemed in my understanding to see a soul thus composed, but far more fair than I can express it.

It then occurred, and so still continues in my mind, that those in Paradise, before the first fall, were in this estate. It seemed to me then, and that hope remains still, that our Lord let me see it, to invite me that way, and because He would give me grace in time to arrive to such an estate, at least in some degree. That word justice, and those in former times that were called just persons, works of justice, done in innocency, and that we be such as we appear, and appear such as we are, those things often since occurred to my mind with a liking of them. And that you may know all, and judge according (though several times since I began to write I have found an extraordinary horror in myself, and withal a fear that you would see it all to be nought, and be much afflicted at it), but howsoever, blessed be our Lord Who hath provided me of such as can tell me which is good. I have moreover thought upon this occasion that perhaps this course of ours would continue till the end of the world, because it came to that in which we first began.

Mary Ward was at this time, as her memorandum shows, arranging the form of her Institute and bringing its details into such a shape as could be laid before the Holy See. The light which she obtained as to the holiness of life requisite in those who are to instruct and mould the minds of others acceptably to God was of inestimable value to her at such a moment, and



left a deep and lasting impression, which never wore away, but which she made use of as a future guide to herself and others. Almighty God enlightened her still further, using the same means, by a repetition of this vision of a just soul three years subsequently. At the present moment she had need of great strength from above, for a heavy sorrow was in store for her, of which she appears to have been little aware, or, perhaps, rather, she shut her eyes, unknown to herself, to the latent fears, which a second letter of hers betrays, as to the future. Father Lee was growing increasingly ill. He had been sent to Brussels and Louvain, in hopes the change to a better climate would reinstate him. But, on the contrary, he became worse, being, in fact, in a consumption, which was fast approaching its termination. The doctors ordered him to try his native air, probably as a last hope of recovery, and thus his long-cherished desire of offering up his life in the English Mission seemed likely to be realized. He came back to St. Omer on his way, but fresh illness obliged him to remain there for some time.

There are notes of two or three addresses given by him during these last days at St. Omer. One of them is a sort of running commentary on the rules of the community. He says: "By reason I am going to take my journey so shortly, and partly by reason your company is increased lately"—perhaps by those Mary Ward brought back with her from England—"as also in the presence of this good Father, that he may better know your proceedings, I thought it good to read your rules and speak a little of some points of them. These are they that by observing you are come to what you are." The Father whom Father Lee thus mentions was most likely Father More,<sup>2</sup> not long afterwards spoken of as the confessor of the community, and who probably succeeded him in that office. In ending, Father Lee says again: "To him I commend you all, and desire you in all things to respect and esteem him as myself, for I may say I found not any since I came to St. Omer's I could more willingly have left you unto."

His words gives us some insight as to the spirit existing among the English Virgins in those days, which he sought to strengthen and encourage. Of the "32nd" Rule—being

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps Father Thomas More, brother of Father Henry More the historian. The former was banished from England when on the mission there, some time subsequently to the year 1614.

ready to beg when required, he says: "O Lord! that this were but once observed amongst you, indeed if it were you would all be great saints, so much doth God concur with them that do use it." Elsewhere he says: "And so you see we must not sit always in contemplation and be good in ourselves, but you must seek also to make others good with the sweat of your brows, and be always ready to give, if need require it, the dearest blood in your bodies for God Almighty's honour." "For the rest, the height of perfection consisteth in a continual denial and abnegation of yourself, and that for desolations in prayer, chapters, reprehensions, little esteem to be made of you, to be employed in mean offices, take all this, as bread from Heaven when they happen unto you, or be laid upon you. But if you can bring yourself them, and to be glad in your soul when you have them, though nature murmur at them, assure yourself you begin Heaven in this world. But this is gotten by long practice and denial of yourself, and especially by making often acts of resignation unto the will of God after communicating."

Father Lee's concluding words in his last beautiful instructions, headed in the manuscript "Practical notes for going forwards in perfection," are: "Almighty God give you grace to persevere; have confidence in God. I for my own part have great confidence, and indeed receive much comfort, now being sent in mission, that is, I am now under the standard of the Cross to fight and give my life and shed my blood for Christ. I only commend this to all, exact observance of religious discipline, especially to officers, for by this those who are under you will profit more, and so Christ Jesus bless you all. God will reward you for all, and I will not be unmindful of you." His prayers for them were to be made before the throne of God in Heaven, and no longer on earth, for Father Lee died within two or three weeks, while waiting for a ship at Dunkirk in which to cross to England. Mary Ward's last letter seems to have been either addressed to him after his leaving St. Omer for that place, or, perhaps, as her own words would show, he was too ill to see her immediately before his departure, and sent her, therefore, his farewell messages through Father Flacke.

It is in unison with the entire conformity of will to God's will, which was one of the graces remarkable in Mary Ward, that not a remark or expression of lamentation or murmuring is to be found in her writings upon an event which was, perhaps,

the heaviest blow possible to be inflicted upon herself and her companions at such a critical moment. Father Roger Lee was the only friend whom Mary had in whom she could wholly trust, and who had a full knowledge and entire sympathy in all her difficulties in the arduous work she had in hand. He knew besides all that God had done both for it and for her, and could weigh and judge her consequent responsibilities with regard to what she was undertaking. She must well have felt that there was no one who could take his place, or on whose council she could depend as she had done upon his. The love and veneration also which Father Lee's great virtues had gained for him, both within and outside his own Order, as well in England as elsewhere, had made his protection and support a bulwark of defence to the young Institute, and to human eyes his prolonged life was consequently of signal importance to its future welfare. But the judgment of Almighty God was altogether different, and Mary was left alone to face her difficulties, and to depend more than ever day by day upon what He Who had begun the work would give for its continuance.

The blow which we have seen she dreaded when dimly seen in the distance was not the less because Mary had learned to believe that it was through no chance accident or human choice, but by a special providence of God, that Father Lee's direction had been given to her and to the rising Institute. Among Mary's writings nine years subsequently, there is a memorandum made by her of special graces which she had received from "our Blessed Saviour and our Blessed Lady." Some of these graces will be described as they occurred at a future time. Of the former, she places as "1st, the spilling of the chalice," which we know was the means finally of her entering upon her religious vocation. The third of the gifts from our Lord she names thus: "Knowledge that Father Lee was ordained by Him for my director and help." The meaning of these words is explained by one of the Painted Life pictures, the twenty-third of the series, which represented "Mary at St. Omer," engaged in prayer, in anxiety as to Father Lee's spiritual direction, and "she resolves to give up both him and everything else which could in the least lessen the perfection of Divine love, when Christ visibly appeared to her and said, 'It is not thou, but I who chose him for thee,' through which she was entirely consoled and freed from all solicitude."

Mary's spiritual state during the period we have been con-

sidering is, perhaps, best shown by a paper in her handwriting,<sup>4</sup> containing thirty-five resolutions which she made. There is no date to this paper, but the contents prove that it was written, perhaps at intervals, during the years previous to Father Lee's death, but after the Institute had taken some degree of shape. It may clearly be seen by some of these resolutions how entirely she submitted to his judgment in affairs connected with it, even when contrary to her own sentiments, but from the recurrence and addition from time to time of more stringent rules for herself concerning obedience, it is plain that this submission was by no means always easy of attainment, and involved her also in outward difficulties.

There is a loose page among Mary Ward's manuscripts, in which she thus writes of Father Roger Lee. After mentioning two occasions on which he had effected cures by making the sign of the cross over the diseased part, she says: "Wonderful was his grace in curing and comforting of souls, as was the progress of those who were directed by him, for I have heard often those say who conversed with him, that none who had conference with him who did not find in his soul an increase of grace. A Father of the Society of the College of St. Omer told me while the good Father was yet living, perhaps on some occasion of wonderful grace that our Lord had bestowed upon him in this kind, offered of his own knowledge; a lady and a certain gentleman of the English nation, being long and grievously perplexed in conscience, and for remedy had often undertaken many painful pilgrimages to favoured places, Our Lady of Loreto, and others, but still remaining very much oppressed in conscience, he happened to declare himself to this our Father, and making a general confession unto him, he departed with singular quiet and unexpected repose of mind. This is all of and concerning happy Father Roger Lee."

---

#### CHAPTER XIV.

##### A MESSAGE TO ROME AND ITS ANSWER.

IT may well be believed that Mary Ward was assisted in the work of drawing up the Rules of her Institute for the eye of the Sovereign Pontiff, by one who was so fast and faithful a friend and so able a counsellor as Father Roger Lee. It was probably

<sup>4</sup> Nymphenburg Manuscripts.

for the very purpose of preparing and finally arranging them that, by his desire, she returned from England. Nothing short of some strong necessity would have brought her back thence, for her heart was ever urging her to be at work among the souls going astray from the true Fold, with whom God had given her such power and success. The task was, nevertheless, by no means an easy one, for that she met with great opposition in putting together the formula of the Institute, especially from the Jesuit Fathers, her own words show very clearly. But they also prove that finally the Rules and Constitutions of the Society of Jesus were adopted in full, so far as they were possible for women to practise. Mary continues her letter to the Nuncio Alberghati thus: "Then would they needs that at least we should take the name of some Order confirmed, or some new one, or any we could think of, so not that of Jesus. This the Fathers of the Society urged exceedingly (and that do still every day more than other) telling us that to any such name we may take what Constitutions we will, even theirs in substance, if otherwise we will not be satisfied: but by no means will they, that we observe that form which their Constitutions and Rules are writ in, which say they, are not essential or needful."

The name and the exterior framework of the Institute were then the two great subjects of discussion. Of these Mary adds further: "The neglect of these offers did and do cause extreme troubles, especially for the first seven years, while my confessor (whom I had tied myself to obey) lived, they urging him in many things to say, as they said, though against his own judgment and knowledge, as after I understood, neither could he yield unto them in all. One time in particular they urged him so much about the name, as that he made answer to divers grave Fathers, that if their case were his they durst not urge any change. Concerning the name, I have twice in several years understood, in as particular a manner as these other things I have recounted, that the denomination of these must be of Jesus. And thrice, I think more often, of the inconveniences would happen to both parts, if ours should have any dependency of the Fathers of the Society."

By this last sentence Mary shows distinctly that she had no design of placing her Institute under the jurisdiction of the Society, in the same way that the Franciscan and Dominican nuns were under that of their respective Orders. It was

perhaps in consideration of the strong feeling evinced against their adopting the name of the Society of Jesus that she and her companions never assumed it for themselves. In no public document do they ever give themselves anything but the humble appellation of the English Virgins or English Ladies. That it was their wish eventually to obtain the name they so much revered, when the Holy See should bless them with its final sanction, it is easy to believe. We find accordingly that their friends, and still more their opposers, readily gave it them and at an early period, and most naturally, from the fact which soon became well known, that their Rules and way of life were modelled after the Rule of St. Ignatius.

Mary's words exhibit the part which Father Lee took in the pending controversy, and the plea which he used in her favour. Paul the Fifth had proved himself a kind friend and patron to the different religious works that had been springing into life during his pontificate and that of his predecessor. It was of primary importance not to delay the intended application, but during his lifetime to seek the fostering protection of the Head of the Church for the young plant which had already begun to feel the premonitory blasts of storms scarcely yet above the horizon. Father Lee in his farewell message to Mary Ward, mentioned by her in her second letter to him, urged this point impressively upon her. It was probably before that Father's death, therefore, and with his co-operation that Mr. Thomas Sackville was selected as the bearer to Rome of the petition of the English Virgins. In a later document of theirs in Italian to be quoted in its place, they name him as "*una persona principale*, of the kingdom of England, a relative of several among themselves, very learned, and of great holiness of life."<sup>1</sup> He must have started for Rome either during the last days of the year 1615, or very early in 1616 (New Style), as the date of the answer of the Holy See to the memorial of which he was the bearer is in April of the latter year. He carried with him also strong recommendatory letters from Bishop Blaise in favour of the

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Thomas Sackville was the founder in pecuniary matters of a "House of Writers," of the English secular clergy, called the "College of Arras," established at Paris in 1611, for the purpose of assisting the Catholics of England in their controversy with Protestants. Dr. Bishop, afterwards Bishop of Chalcedon, was one of the original members. Dr. Champney, another of them, writes of Sackville to More, the agent of the secular clergy in Rome: "Assure yourself he is the fittest man I know to take away all let, and set forward all good designs."



new Institute, to the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. There are no copies either of these letters or of Mary Ward's memorial in the archives of the English Ladies at Nymphenburg, but a duplicate of the reply of Paul the Fifth to Bishop Blaise through Cardinal Lancellotti remains, and upon it still, what is of present interest, the Cardinal's seal with the inscription round it, *Horatius S. R. E. Præs. Cardinalis Lancellottus, Præs. Cong. Concil.* The following is a translation from the Latin original.

[Duplicate.]

"Very Illustrious and Most Reverend Lord and Brother,—Some Virgins of England, driven by persecution from their fatherland and assembled together by love of the Catholic religion, have lately represented to our most holy Lord, that by pious works and example of holy life, as far as Divine mercy grants, they devote themselves to the salvation of souls, and that they receive other compatriot girls rescued from the midst of the impiety of their fatherland to be instructed in learning and Christian meekness and modesty. And that they may be able to go on in their vocation and serve Almighty God more studiously, amongst other things, they have humbly asked for commendatory letters to the ecclesiastical prelates. But when His Holiness referred their petition to the Sacred Congregation of Cardinals, interpreters of the Council of Trent, the most illustrious Fathers, considering their request most just, have commanded letters to be addressed, which We do, to your Lordship that you would be pleased to undertake the chief care and protection of the same Virgins, and to aid them when it shall be needful, no otherwise than as his pastoral solicitude now long promises, that they may be the more inflamed to religion and produce daily more abundant fruits of their labours by Divine help. And if, as we trust, it shall so happen, then the Apostolic See will also deliberate about confirming their Institute. Meanwhile your Lordship must persuade itself, if you shall afford what we have above written you will not only do a thing most pleasing to the Sacred Congregation and so to our most holy Lord, but also will have Christ the Lord, Whose interests you will be promoting, perpetually mindful of your piety and beneficence. Rome, April 10, 1616. Of your Very Illustrious and Most Reverend Lordship's Brother,

"HOR. CARDINAL LANCELOTTI."

How well Mr. Thomas Sackville had fulfilled his errand may be inferred by the short interval which elapsed before the despatch and arrival of this letter, at a period when journeys were slow and posts equally tardy and uncertain. The joy which the receipt of the document must have caused to the community at St. Omer, especially at the implied hope of confirmation at a future time, could only have been damped by the loss of the kind Father, to whose labours they in large measure owed the success of the mission to Rome, and the thought that he was no longer on earth who would more than any other have rejoiced in their gladness.

— Mary Ward in addressing Pope Gregory the Thirteenth some years subsequently, speaks of having lived with her companions according to the rule of life practised by the Society of Jesus from the year they went to St. Omer. Father Lee's address upon the rules of the community show these to have been hitherto, rather an arrangement from those of St. Ignatius, than the actual rules themselves. But from what Mary writes to the Nuncio, she must finally have obtained the rules and adopted them, perhaps before the mission to Rome, as they stood word for word, except where they contained what was unsuitable for women, and with a few additions necessary from present circumstances. Father Lohner gives a kind of *précis* both of the practice of the English Virgins as to the rules, and of the order of their day, at this period, which contains in a condensed form their whole religious status.

"The usual order of the day," he says,<sup>2</sup> "is this: At four o'clock in the morning they are awoke, and at half-past four they meditate for an hour; the rest of the time until eight o'clock is spent in hearing Mass, vocal prayer, and spiritual reading; then they go to the business of their house and offices, and remain thus until a quarter to ten, at which time the examination of conscience is performed for a quarter of an hour, and afterwards they go immediately to dinner. When dinner is ended, a liberal recreation is granted until half-past twelve, after which half an hour is again passed in spiritual reading, and then they betake themselves to their several duties in the house and their offices until five o'clock, from which time until six they apply themselves to vocal prayer. At six o'clock follow supper and recreation until eight, then they say together the Litanies of our Lady and the Saints, and whatever else the

<sup>2</sup> *Gottseliges Leben*, p. 74.

Superioress enjoins; after which examen is made for a quarter of an hour, the points for meditation on the following day are read aloud, and the usual night's rest is taken."

Father Lohner's summary shows that to the three vows which the English Virgins took, was added a promise not to leave the Institute. This promise was subjoined perhaps when Mary arranged all the details to send to Rome, for of an earlier period Father Lee says, in the address when Barbara Babthorpe was made Superior: "Hitherto it hath been only love that hath holden you all together and no other tie or obligation." To give the framework of the new Institute more solidity, it was doubtless considered better to have some equivalent for the vow of stability and thus to give it a bulwark, though in another form, such as perpetual inclosure was to cloistered orders. The formula of this promise has been preserved, and comes down among the papers<sup>3</sup> and letters of the agents of the secular clergy at Rome, dating about 1625. In the margin on the top of the paper is written: "I had this on condition to show it to none, but to my lord of Chalcedon and to one other; so I pray show it none, but use it for public occasion." It is headed:

*A coppie of the Inglish Jesuitieses vowve to Mrs. Marye Ward who these call Mother Cheefe Superior.*

I, N. N., seeing clearly how much I am bound to God for His gracious vocation of me to so high and happy a course as this, wherein I have by the assistance of God's grace dedicated myself unto Him by the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience usual in our company. And considering how much I am obliged in charity, justice, and gratitude to the company and Superiors thereof, for their acceptance of me, and my education in the noviciate and otherwise in the spirit and practice of the said company, and thereby am much enabled (if the faults be not in myself) to proceed with more fruit and facility towards my own perfection and helping to the perfection of my neighbour.

Being moved with these just reasons, and greatly desirous in our Lord that this work of God in me and others may be brought to the ripeness and perfection of a religious order by the confirmation of the See Apostolic, I do therefore make *promise*, and covenant with our Chief Superior, and the rest of the whole company, that I will live and remain in the same, notwithstanding all oppositions and difficulties that may occur, and will endeavour by the practice of obedience, in perfect union and subordination to serve the company in all occasions that I

<sup>3</sup> In the archives of the diocese of Westminster.

can, and never to seek to be freed from this obligation or from my vows, by Superiors, or by other means, until God grant the confirmation of our Institute, that I may renew my religious vows therein; esteeming it a great wrong to this holy company (besides my own irreparable loss) if I should attempt to dismember it of any one subject it hath brought up, and is to use in the practice of the honourable ministries we are to serve God and the Church in, to the discouragement also of others, and lessening thereby our hopes and helps towards confirmation.

And so by this, having first commended the matter to God with due consideration and desire to perform my duty to God and man, do oblige myself by this contract, inseparably of my part to the company as aforesaid, so long as the Chief Superior should think it needful to keep me, and not dismiss me, according to the tenour of the vows.

In witness whereof I have subscribed my name.

Die                      mensi                      anno dni.                      N.N.

## *Catholic Review.*

---

### I.—NOTES ON THE PRESS.

#### I.—LETTER OF THE HOLY FATHER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

OUR readers will be glad to see in these pages the Letter which His Holiness Leo the Thirteenth has addressed to the Archbishop of Dublin, on the subject of the disturbed state of Ireland.

To our Venerable Brother Edward M'Cabe, Archbishop of Dublin, Primate of Ireland.

Venerable Brother,—Health and Apostolic Benediction. We read with pleasure your letter recently addressed to the clergy and people of the diocese of Dublin, and presented to Us by you when you were in Rome; for in it We recognized your prudence and moderation, since, while Ireland is now deeply moved, partly by a desire for better things, partly by a fear of an uncertain future, you offer counsel admirably suited to the occasion.

The unhappy condition of Catholics in Ireland disquiets and afflicts Us, and We highly esteem their virtue, sorely tried by adversity, not for a brief period only, but for many centuries. For with the greatest fortitude and constancy they preferred to endure every misfortune rather than forsake the religion of their fathers or deviate, even in the slightest degree, from their ancient fidelity to this Apostolic See. Moreover, it is their singular glory, extending down to the present time, that most noble proofs of all the other virtues were never wanting amongst them. These reasons force Us to love them with paternal benevolence, and fervently to wish that the evils by which they are afflicted may quickly be brought to an end.

At the same time, We unhesitatingly declare that it is their duty to be carefully on their guard not to allow the fame of their sterling and hereditary probity to be lessened, and not to

commit any rash act whereby they may seem to have cast aside the obedience due to their lawful rulers; and for this reason, whenever Ireland has been greatly excited in guarding and defending her own interests, the Roman Pontiffs have constantly endeavoured by admonition and exhortation to allay the excited feelings, lest by a disregard of moderation justice might be violated, or a cause, however right in itself, might be kindled by the influence of passions into the flame of sedition. These counsels were always directed to the end that the Catholics of Ireland should in all things follow the Church as a guide and teacher, and, thoroughly conforming themselves to her precepts, should reject the allurements of pernicious doctrines. Thus the Supreme Pontiff Gregory the Sixteenth, on the 12th of March, 1839, and on the 15th of October, 1844, through the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, admonished the Archbishop of Armagh to do nothing except with justice and moderation. And We, following the example of Our predecessor, took care, on the 1st of June last year, as you are aware, to give to all the Bishops of Ireland the salutary admonitions which the occasion demanded—namely, that the Irish people should obey the Bishops, and in no particular deviate from the sacredness of duty. And a little later, in the month of November, We testified to some Irish Bishops who had come to visit the tombs of the Apostles, that We ardently desired every good gift for the people of Ireland; but We also added that order should not be disturbed.

This manner of thinking and acting is entirely conformable to the ordinances and laws of the Catholic Church, and We have no doubt that it will conduce to the interests of Ireland. For We have confidence in the justice of the men who are placed at the head of the State, and who certainly, for the most part, have great practical experience, combined with prudence in civil affairs. Ireland may obtain what she wants much more safely and readily if only she adopts a course which the laws allow, and avoids giving causes of offence.

Therefore, Venerable Brother, you and your colleagues in the Episcopate will direct your efforts to the end that the people of Ireland, in this anxious condition of affairs, do not transgress the bounds of equity and justice. We have assuredly received from the Bishops, the clergy, and the people of Ireland many proofs of reverence and affection; and if now, in a willing spirit, they obey these counsels and Our authority, as We are certain



they will, they may feel assured that they have fulfilled their own duty, and have completely satisfied Us.

Finally from Our heart We implore God to look down propitiously on Ireland, and in the meantime, as a pledge of heavenly gifts, We affectionately impart in the Lord the Apostolical Benediction to you, Venerable Brother, to the other Bishops of Ireland, and to the entire clergy and people.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, on the 3rd day of January, 1881, in the third year of Our Pontificate.

LEO PP. XIII.

This most important document has, as far as we are aware, elicited but little comment from the English press. But the comparative silence with which it has been received is a sign rather of the general sense of its importance than of any indifference to its meaning. It is not, we conceive, the business of Catholic writers to interpret or to put their own glosses on the words of His Holiness. But three things at least are very clear from the fact that he has thought it his duty to speak in this decided manner. First, it is clear that the Holy Father watches with the most tender interest, not, in this case, unmixed with anxiety, the proceedings in Ireland which, during the last few months, have drawn the attention of the whole Empire, and indeed the whole of Europe, to her condition and to the immense facilities which that condition affords for agitation or a most exceptional kind. In the next place, it is clear that Leo the Thirteenth, like those of his predecessors who are named in his Letter, recognizes the danger of possible revolutionary action and of the use of unlawful, unjust, and terrorist means for the accomplishment of popular ends, as a fact which makes it imperative to speak in words of the most loving and parental warning. Lastly, it is plain that the Holy Father looks to the firmness, the sagacity, the prudence, and the independence of the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland to furnish the people with the safeguards which they need in these critical times against the many influences which are at work to lead them astray from the path of right and justice. Never was there a greater opportunity for Ireland than at present—but it is an opportunity which may very possibly be missed. The true friends and guides of the people have been called upon by the Father of all Catholics to see that it is not missed by any fault of Ireland, and we may confidently trust that the call will not have been made in vain.

## 2.—"THE CASE OF IRELAND STATED."

*The Case of Ireland Stated*, by Miss Cusack, better known as the "Nun of Kenmare," reached us so late in last December that we were unable to speak of it in our last issue. It is written with all the earnestness, not to say passion, which might be expected from its distinguished author. We fear that on this very account it is little likely to make its way in this country; and, besides, the "Case of Ireland" is at present being "stated" with great ability and at great length in the House of Commons by the legitimate representatives of the Irish people. Moreover, the two "Statements" are not, we fear, altogether harmonious. Miss Cusack's "Case" is partly based on some very natural misconceptions as to the state of opinion and feeling on this side of St. George's Channel. Nothing is more clear, when there is an occasion for ascertaining the truth, than that newspapers do not accurately represent the mind of a country like ours. To go no further back than less than a year ago, any one who had conjectured the probable result of the last General Election from the newspapers would certainly have predicted a long tenure of office to the Ministry of Lord Beaconsfield. We do not think, as a matter of fact, that the English press in general speaks savagely about Ireland: but some newspapers may do so, and if they do, they do not represent England. Miss Cusack complains that English people are ignorant of Ireland "socially" because they do not read the Irish papers, and English papers give, with few exceptions, only "one side of the question." Well—and how many sides of the question, as to Ireland itself, and as to English feeling towards Ireland, do Irish papers give? and how many Irish people read English newspapers? We venture to say that the verdict of any impartial English Catholic on reading Miss Cusack's book, and on comparing its representation of English feeling and opinion with the facts known to himself, will be as we say—that the picture is altogether as one-sided and as distorted as any representation of Irish feeling and opinion in an English newspaper can be. When Miss Cusack tells us this or that about our own countrymen, we can only say that we are inclined to put a "not" before almost every single statement. The "English opinion" of Miss Cusack is the opinion of an imaginary England, not the actual and living England. Now, do not let

us be misunderstood. We do not at all complain of the misconceptions which prevail in Ireland as to this country. We think they are very natural misconceptions, though we regret them exceedingly, as we regret still more the long series of facts in the past on which they are built. But when persons complain of our misconceptions of them, we have some right to ask whether they have taken any better means of informing themselves concerning us, than those very means to which they impute the existence of what they think are our own misunderstandings concerning themselves.

The tone of Miss Cusack's book will, we fear, preclude it from obtaining many favourable readers among Englishmen—if it is written for them. This is all the more to be regretted, inasmuch as it contains many facts well worthy of attention. The general outline of the argument may be stated in her own words in a passage which we extract from the Preface—leaving out what we consider so unfortunate, as to the generally bad opinion which Englishmen entertain of their Irish fellow-subjects. "While the Irish people," says Miss Cusack, "are simply asking for such laws to be made in England as will protect their lives, and enable them to live in peace and on the poorest food, the landlords are clamouring for coercion, so that their tenants may be compelled either to pay rents which will not leave them sufficient for bare existence, or to drive them out of their homes and their country. . . . The present Land League agitation is simply the strike of a whole nation against unjust government: that in all strikes acts of violence are committed, for which the leaders are not responsible; and that far fewer acts of violence have been committed in this great national strike than in any English strike. . . . That those who refuse to pay more than Griffiths' valuation are not doing so from dishonest motives, or because they are unwilling to pay any rent, but that they are doing so on the principle on which all English labour strikes are carried out, *i.e.*, contending for more to be given to the man and less to the master—for more to be given to labour, and less to capital. . . . The Irish people cannot in justice give all to the landlord, and refuse to pay the shopkeeper, who has given them credit in the famine; *i.e.*, they know of no moral law which makes it justifiable to give all to the landlord, and nothing to their other creditors. . . . Lastly, I am firmly convinced that the principal cause why Irish grievances are not remedied is because Ireland is governed at

the caprice of party, and not as an integral portion of the United Kingdom."

Nothing can be more to the point than all this—if only this is the true "Case of Ireland," for which the legitimate efforts of the Irish people are directed. Unfortunately, this is "the Case of Ireland," if you like, as stated by Archbishop M'Cabe—though he has not taken up the defence of the Land League, as Miss Cusack has—and by Miss Cusack herself, but it is not the "Case of Ireland" as stated by the Protestant leader of the Irish Parliamentary representatives in the House of Commons. There is nothing here about getting rid of landlords altogether, nothing about transferring to the people the whole property in the land. If Miss Cusack has not understated her case—we do not say whether she has or not—the remedy of the miseries of Ireland ought not to be far to seek. Taking her last assertion first, certainly there never was a time when both the great parties in the British Parliament were more thoroughly determined to lay aside all other considerations, and to unite heartily and frankly in carrying measures which may cut to the root all real evils of which Irishmen have to complain. There can be no reasonable doubt whatever, that if the Irish people "are simply asking for laws which will protect their lives and enable them to live," such laws will certainly be forthcoming. We have never been able to understand the comparison between the Land League agitation and any (lawful) English strike, for the simple reason that persons engaged in a strike do not continue to live in their employers' houses and on the produce of their employers' property. But no Englishman would see any objection to seeing the conduct of those who are, as Miss Cusack puts it, "out on strike," regulated by the same principles of morality as are observed by honest and religious minded men in such cases. Miss Cusack speaks in the next place of those who refuse to pay more than "Griffiths' valuation"—but she says nothing of those who refuse to pay anything at all, or who are prevented by "coercion" from paying anything. Here again, the principle which she assigns for the conduct of the Land Leaguers or others might very well be admitted—but would it cover the facts of the case as she herself knows them? A "strike" is one thing—a system of "rattening" is another thing. Again, as to the comparison between debts to the landlord and debts to the shopkeeper, we have nothing to say against it. But does the statement that "the Irish people

cannot give all to the landlord and refuse to pay the shop-keeper" correspond with the facts? She will certainly agree with us that no people can be obliged to pay anything when they are altogether unable to do so, but that when they are, there is no "moral law," either for the Irish or for any other people, which *deprives* the landlord of his stipulated rights any more than any other creditor. We think the troubles of the House of Commons would soon be at an end, if the actual demands of the Irish people were no more than what they are made to be in this passage. The just demands of the Irish people will certainly not be refused by any English Government in the present day. But political agitation may press demands which are in themselves unjust, and may urge the use of means which are exactly of that character which Pope Leo the Thirteenth has branded with his reprobation.

---

### 3.—RITUALISTS OUT OF PRISON.

At the time at which we write, it is uncertain whether the Ritualistic and High Church parties in the Establishment will indulge in any great amount of satisfaction at the decision of the Court of Appeal in the matter of Messrs. Dale and Enraght. Every principle for which these gentlemen, and the parties behind them, were contending, with the purpose of justifying their resistance to the authority of Lord Penzance and the Court over which he presides, has been as strongly combated by the Court of Appeal as by the Court of Queen's Bench. The result of the litigation has been the solemn affirmation, by each of these great Courts separately, of the absolutely authoritative character of the judge whom the Ritualists hold in so great abhorrence. On the other hand, to the satisfaction no less than to the surprise of the public, the judges of the Appeal Court saw their way to setting Messrs. Dale and Enraght free from the duration to which their disobedience to Lord Penzance had consigned them, on account of a petty informality in the process, which was probably the fault of an underling, and which in no way casts any slur on the judge or the tribunal. We say the public are satisfied, because the public in these days does not care to see clergymen put into prison, as it thinks, for some foolish fancies about vestments. That was not the cause of the imprisonment of Mr. Dale and Mr. Enraght—but the British public does not care to inform itself with extreme

accuracy on such points as these. It only knows that if these gentlemen had not departed from the ordinary customs and costumes of Anglican Ministers, they would never have been committed to prison, and that is enough.

We notice already a calming down of the feelings which their proceedings have excited in the breasts of so many good Anglicans. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who certainly knows how to deal with the Anglican clergy, has declared that if the discontented parties will only say what they want, he hopes that a remedy may be found, and has received an address signed by many most eminent and respectable clergymen, headed by the Deans of St. Paul's and of Durham, in which address we seem to see the beginning of the withdrawal of the older High Church party from the position which many of them had before taken up. For some time after the incident of Mr. Dale's imprisonment, nothing would satisfy the discontented Anglicans but the creation of a new tribunal altogether for the judgment of Church questions. The establishment of a new Court would undoubtedly be a great gain to the High Church party, though the decisions of such a Court as is alone likely to be granted them would, very probably, be often hostile to the teaching and practice of that party. But the blows which are so intolerable when they come from the secular arm would be soft and sweet when inflicted by the tender hands of Anglican bishops. We should say that such a Court as has been proposed by Canon Liddon was the indisputable right of the Anglicans, if it were not for the stern historical facts connected with the substitution of Royal for Papal supremacy which Canon Liddon and his friends so persistently ignore. At all events, this demand for a new Court is kept back. It must be obvious to the simplest mind that, even if Mr. Gladstone had the time to give which the construction of a new measure on the subject would require, as well as the goodwill on his own part, he would break his power with the people and with Parliament to pieces if he were to propose any new legislation on the matter in the direction desired by the High Churchmen. The alteration of the present Courts would probably never be a matter as to the details of which the various parties in the Establishment could agree, but even if they did, Parliament would never be willing to make the alteration.

The High Churchmen, therefore, are wise in limiting their positive demands, in the first instance, to the concession of



greater toleration in the matter of ritual. How far the law leaves this absolutely in the hands of the Bishops, it is not for us to say; but if an alteration of the present law is required, it will be difficult to compass the granting of the request. Looking at the matter from outside, we have but one remark to make on the very moderate petition which has been presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is another instance of the entire change which has come over the High Church party in the last thirty years. Thirty years ago, they would not have been willing to ask for toleration. The ideas of the High Churchmen of those days did not contemplate the "live and let live" principle with which even Dr. Pusey is now so much in love. In those days, the mere toleration of an unorthodox doctrine about Baptism was held to be incompatible with the supposed "Catholicism" of the Anglican Establishment. The same men who then used such strong language about the Gorham judgment, which "tolerated" heresy as to Baptism, now rest—as on the charter of their liberties—on the "Bennett" judgment, which "tolerates" what they consider orthodoxy on the subject of the Holy Eucharist. As a matter of fact, it is hardly true to say that the "Bennett" judgment placed the doctrine of the Real Presence on so secure a footing in the Establishment as that on which the "Gorham" judgment placed the doctrine which denies Baptismal Regeneration. Yet this is now considered the one great judicial triumph of the High Church party. It is enough for them that they are not to be punished for holding or teaching the very modified bit of Catholicity maintained by Mr. Bennett. That is to say that the High Churchmen of the present day have no true idea of the Church at all, and, as they hold certain Catholic doctrines, as they think, but on the principle of private judgment, so they demand the right to teach and hold their doctrines practically on the principle of the "wide and large-minded liberality" of a "policy of comprehension." The "Church of England" is the "Church of the English," and every Briton has a right to hold in it—whatever he likes to hold.

---

4.—THE LAST SESSION OF THE CONGREGATION DE AUXILIIS.

In the year 1588, Father Louis Molina, of the Society of Jesus, published his celebrated book, *Liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis, divini præscientiæ, providentiæ, prædestinationis*

*et reprobatione concordia.* The doctrine therein maintained was immediately denounced by the Dominican Father, Thomas Bañez, and the famous controversy, *De Auxiliis Gratiæ*, began then, and was continued with increasing asperity under Clement the Eighth and Paul the Fifth, until it was brought to an abrupt termination in 1607 by an injunction of the Holy Father imposing silence upon both parties. Each school of theology was to be at liberty to retain and teach its own opinion, but neither was to venture to condemn the other. Paul the Fifth did not choose to settle the dispute, and no inferior authority was competent to pronounce anathema. In fact it had been made apparent in the course of many angry debates that no point of Catholic belief was directly impugned by either party in the strife. Both admitted the necessity of grace moving the will to act, and both admitted the freedom of the will under the action of grace. The clearness or obscurity of the explanation by which they sought to harmonize the power of Divine grace and the freedom of human choice did not immediately affect their tenure of doctrine. The Dominicans were not Calvinists, and the Fathers of the Society of Jesus were not Pelagians, however much in the heat of the contest they might have been inclined to put a harsh construction upon phrases not yet secured by an infallible definition, but still lying on the anvil and undergoing the process of being hammered into shape. Paul the Fifth certainly never thought that the question was unimportant, or a mere war of words, but he may well have believed that it would be better to wait until all angry feeling had subsided. We only know what he did, not why he did it. Motives were freely imputed to him by a bitter opponent of the Society of Jesus, Augustine Le Blanc (whose real name was Hyacinth Serry), Doctor of Theology in the University of Louvain, such as no Catholic ought to think of attributing to a Pontiff in the exercise of his highest duty. It is pleasing to have in our hands at last a categorical contradiction of those unjust surmises in a memorandum written by Paul the Fifth himself. Father Schneemann, the indefatigable editor of the *Collectio Lacensis*, has discovered a document of which the genuineness seems beyond question, and of which the value will be readily recognized by all theologians, and many others. It supplies the long-desired answer to a question which the historians of this controversy have hitherto acknowledged themselves unable to determine.

Francis Xavier Mannhardt, S.J., writing in 1762, speaks as follows in his summary of the two folio volumes of Livinus Meyer :<sup>1</sup>

After these points had been long and diligently discussed before his tribunal in the year 1606, Pope Paul the Fifth, to put an end at last to this controversy, having collected the votes of the examiners, laid the matter before the Cardinals alone, and gave it careful consideration. What took place in that decisive meeting is a secret not yet divulged to anybody. For to the present time it has not been ascertained from documentary evidence whether any conclusion was formed with regard to condemning or approving either opinion, or, more probably, leaving both opinions open to free discussion in the future.

Then he quotes a passage from Hyacinth Serry containing one of the unjust conjectures to which the new-found document opposes a distinct and formal denial :

There were, says an adversary, Le Blanc, some who declared that the Pope and five Cardinals pronounced in favour of an Apostolic definition, while four spoke against it.

What kind of Apostolic definition he meant Serry was careful to explain. According to him the supporters of Molina are not disputants waiting for a settlement, but criminals respited from well-deserved punishment. In his opinion they owed their escape from the censure of heresy which they had fully merited to an act of weakness by which Paul the Fifth postponed the interests of eternal truth and the welfare of the Universal Church to a private and personal consideration. The Fathers of the Society of Jesus had treated him with marked respect at their own grave peril in a late quarrel with the Government of Venice, and he could not consent to repay their political loyalty by anathematizing their doctrine. This is what Serry dares to say :

Meanwhile, the men of the Sodality of Jesus, smarting from the wound inflicted by the Senate of Venice on occasion of the Papal interdict, found a good deal of comfort in the delay of the definition. They regarded as a glory, a singular favour and a pledge of safety, a disgrace which came to them as a preservative from greater evils, and which snatched their Society from impending destruction as it lay tempest-tost awaiting sentence from day to day. Wise physicians must they be, and endowed with more than human skill, who can thus derive from their very wounds increase of health, and can make even the anger of the gods serve to complete their happiness. For who does

<sup>1</sup> *Thesaurus Theol.* tom. v. Opus. vi. c. 3.

not know that it is a kind of happiness to delinquents, terrified by the thought of impending judgment, to receive the message that the sentence has been postponed, and to hear that the closing scene, with all its ignominy, instead of being, as they supposed, close at hand, has been deferred to another occasion?<sup>2</sup>

After this it is certainly interesting to read the memorandum jotted down at the time by Paul the Fifth for his own use to assist him to remember what had taken place in that secret consistory, destined to be so wonderfully misrepresented.

From the autograph,<sup>3</sup> of which we shall quote the first paragraph and the more important parts in the words of Paul the Fifth literally translated, we take the following particulars.

"On August 28, 1607, the feast of St. Augustine, Doctor of the Church, on the Quirinal, a session of the Congregation *de Auxiliis divinæ gratiæ* was held, at which were present Cardinals Pinelli, d'Ascoli, de Givry, Bianchetto, Arrigone, Bellarmine, du Perron, Buffalo, and Sant' Eusebio."

Cardinal Pinelli was not satisfied with the report sent in by the Consultors and wished the matter to be more fully investigated, suggesting that in the meantime some points upon which all were agreed might be defined.

Cardinal d'Ascoli pressed for an immediate definition, but desired that everything personal might be carefully excluded, quoting a precedent for this prudent precaution. "For this reason, his advice was, that in the decision which, he thought, was by all means to be pronounced in accordance with the vote of the Consultors, expressing approbation of the censure passed by them upon the forty-two selected propositions, great care should be taken not to mention the Jesuit Fathers; wherefore he proposed that concerning the chief point of physical pre-determination, a special Bull should be drawn up in which it would be explained that a controversy had arisen between some theologians about the interpretation of the Council of Trent, inasmuch as the Council having said: *Necessario requiritur quod liberum arbitrium sit motum a Deo*, some hold that God moves *physice, realiter, et efficienter*, while others say it is *congrue et moraliter*; wherefore, &c. As to the forty-two propositions taken from Molina's book, they should be condemned as contained in Molina's book."

<sup>2</sup> *Historia Congregationum de Auxiliis*. Autore Augustino Leblanc, S. Theol. Doct. Lovanii, 1700.

<sup>3</sup> Weitere Entwicklung der thomistisch—molinistischen Controverse. Gerhard Schneeman, S.J. Freiburg in Brissgau, 1880. At the end of the book is a facsimile of the autograph.

— *Cardinal de Givry* inclined to the opinion which gave more power to Divine grace, but he acknowledged the difficulty of the question, and thought with *Cardinal Pinelli* that further investigation was desirable.

*Cardinal Bianchetto* also liked best the opinion of the Dominican Fathers, but he wished it to be clearly ascertained that the propositions attributed to Molina were really his.

*Cardinal Arrigone* "agreed in this" [apparently in the last remark only, for he went on to say that he did not think Molina's book ought to be suspended.]

*Cardinal Bellarmine* said: "The opinion of physical pre-determination was the opinion of Calvin and Luther: the Dominican Fathers were excusable because they had not seen the books of the heretics; Bañez had spoken worse than Molina, blaming St. Augustine in the matter of reprobation; Molina's book had been approved by two Universities; a Bull might be drawn up in which some propositions about which there is no doubt, both parties being of one mind, should be condemned, whilst the more difficult points should be left untouched, as was done by Celestine."

*Cardinal Du Perron* said: "The opinion of physical pre-determination would be willingly accepted and subscribed to by the heretics, &c.; Calvin enunciated it *in sensu supposito*, and the Council of Trent condemned it *in sensu supposito*, saying that man can reject grace. The Cardinal endeavoured to show that the opinion of the Jesuits is far removed from Pelagianism by means of many quotations from St. Augustine, wherein St. Augustine shows that the Pelagians admitted neither illumination in the intellect, nor preparation in the will, but the outward law and doctrine alone; Molina's book ought on no account to be suspended, but rather Bañez, for the aforesaid reasons; it should be intimated that the affair was not concluded and that additional precautions were contemplated, but no further inquiries should be made; the question should be deferred, and allowed to lull—God would perhaps bring the parties to an agreement or make them differ less widely."

*Cardinal Buffalo* desired either a definition of some kind, or a declaration that both opinions were probable. Any further delay would be not only undignified but mischievous.

*Cardinal di Sant' Eusebio* thought that no step need be taken unless the one or the other opinion was found to be heretical, in which case a decision ought to be given.

Paul the Fifth thus records his own sentiments. "We:—In the grace of the Lord the Council had defined that it is necessary *quod liberum arbitrium moveatur a Deo*, and the difficulty turned upon this, *an moveat physice vel moraliter*; although it were desirable that this controversy should not have place in the Church—because discords often are the occasion of errors, and therefore it is good to remove them—nevertheless, We did not think that there was at present this necessity, seeing that the opinion of the Dominicans is far removed from that of Calvin, since, according to the Dominicans, *Gratia non destruit sed perficit liberum arbitrium*, causing man to act *juxta modum suum*, that is, *libere*; while the Jesuits differ from the Pelagians, who made salvation begin from ourselves, the former maintaining the very opposite. As, therefore, no urgent necessity existed for coming to a definition, the matter might be postponed in order that time might be our counsellor."

He adds a few observations on minor details of the business, and concludes with the request that the proceedings of the conference might be kept secret.

Commentary is needless. Against the gratuitous conjecture that the Pope and five Cardinals desired the condemnation of Molina's doctrine, we find the Pope himself exculpating Molina, and out of the nine Cardinals only one demanding the condemnation. Of the remaining number two expressed a mild preference for the Thomist doctrine, two (unquestionably the greatest theologians there present) spoke very strongly against it, and the other four said nothing about the doctrinal question either to defend or to attack Molina, but confined themselves to the one consideration of opportuneness, and expressed their several desires of immediate settlement or further delay.

NOTE TO THE ARTICLE ON "SAINTS BARLAAM AND JOSAPHAT."

An apology is due to Mr. Rhys Davids, the distinguished Oriental scholar, for an incidental allusion to his recent work in our last number (p. 137). The article in which it occurs is professedly derived from the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, but the words in which an implied criticism was conveyed were founded upon an article in a weekly paper. A closer acquaintance with the censured book shows that our conclusion was hasty and ungrounded.



II.—REVIEWS.

1. *The Life of Henri-Marie Boudon, Archdeacon of Evreux.* Burns and Oates, 1880.

THE seventh volume of Mr. Healy Thompson's Library of Religious Biography is consecrated to the memory of the saintly Archdeacon of Evreux, not only in order to put before Catholic readers in England one more example of the highest virtue, but also to introduce to their notice the author of some ascetic works which are less widely known than they deserve to be. It was the characteristic of M. Boudon's career that he was selected to be the victim for a time of malignant calumnies, but that he lived to have his innocence entirely vindicated. A suspicion of false pietism was afterwards allowed to fall upon certain books written by him before the date of the great controversy in which Bossuet triumphed over Fénelon; but, although it would have been an easy thing before Rome had spoken to have slipped into some inaccuracy of thought or expression in treating of a subject so delicate and subtle as the nature and properties of Divine love in perfect souls, yet in point of fact M. Boudon did not lay himself open to the charge of doubtful teaching. The only foundation in fact for the prejudice which once existed against two of his books, *Dieu Seul*, published in 1662, and his *Règne de Dieu dans l'Oraison Mentale*, is that in 1696 one particular edition of the former work, published at Milan but copied from a Belgian edition, was placed upon the *Index*, not because it was M. Boudon's *Dieu Seul*, but precisely because it was not. It was an unfaithful reproduction containing objectionable passages, and one whole chapter added by a malicious or ignorant interpolator. It is well known that one Venetian edition of the great work of Father Thomas Sanchez was similarly prohibited, but the reputation of that illustrious theologian has not been damaged by the censure of words which never fell from his pen, though they were given to the world in his name. Bossuet, keen-sighted to detect that particular blemish for which the peccant edition was afterwards condemned, warmly praised the *Dieu Seul*, fifty thousand copies were sold in Paris alone, and not till more than thirty years had passed from the date of its publication was any voice raised against it.

Henri-Marie Boudon was born in 1624 and died in 1702.

He owed his name to the august lady who held him in her arms at the christening, our own Henrietta-Maria, who, with two other royal ladies, Anne of Austria and Mary de Medicis, happened to be present at the ceremony and consented to be godmother. This unwonted honour may have been a matter of congratulation and sanguine hopes to the parents, but Henri-Marie was never known to allude to it. A far more important event in his eyes, and one which gave a colouring to all his life, was the consecration by which his mother vowed him to the service of our Blessed Lady. Before his birth she had resolved to secure this grace for her little one, and she lost no time in fulfilling her promise privately. As soon as her health permitted, she and her husband made a pilgrimage to Notre Dame de Liesse for the purpose of renewing the consecration with greater solemnity. Henri-Marie never faltered in his devotion to that Blessed Mother, who had thus claimed him from his first infancy.

The deep regret which St. Aloysius showed for some little faults committed in childhood, which ordinary men would have forgotten or would have never noticed, might show us if we did not know it otherwise that he had no grave offences to deplore, and in the same way we find a proof of the wonderfully blameless life of Henri Boudon in the abiding sorrow for two actions which he confessed with many tears when he was nine years old. He once drank wine in the sacristy without permission after serving Mass, and he once, at the request of an unworthy monk, kept some money for a few hours that it might escape the eyes of the Superior when he was making his visitation. Certainly this was a cooperation in sin, but a child could not possibly appreciate the wickedness of such a violation of the vow of poverty.

With the changeableness which sometimes marks the behaviour of Frenchwomen, Madame Boudon, shortly after she had placed her little boy so solemnly under the protection of a better Mother, seemed to lose her maternal instinct. Her excellent husband died, and she distressed her friends by marrying after some brief delay a man of very different stamp, a village surgeon of coarse mind and repulsive manners, who showed nothing but harshness and injustice to Henri from the first, and succeeding in depriving the poor child of the love which he had the fullest right to claim. Madame Boudon under this sombre influence neglected Henri's education, and left him

to take care of himself as if she had been made into his step-mother by her second marriage. He suffered less by this neglect than most children would have done, for he persistently read pious books and tried to be good. At eight years old he showed a decided disinclination to learn his Latin grammar, and, as his mother did not care enough for him to insist upon a continuous effort, he went back to his spiritual books, and it was not till three years later, when he was old enough to see the close connection between learning Latin and pleasing God, that he applied himself to the uncongenial task. However, without a preceptor he could not, with all his cleverness, make much progress, and he was sent to Rouen to live with a holy priest of that town and attend the classes in the College of the Society of Jesus. Here he led the life of a saint, urged forward by his ardent love of our Blessed Lady to works of mercy to others and mortification, which seem scarcely credible in one so young. All his fellow-students were not animated by the same spirit, and he experienced in his schoolboy days a foretaste of that particular kind of trial which God destined to be chief agent in his sanctification. Some young reprobates had been guilty of gross misconduct in public, and they agreed among themselves to denounce young Boudon as the prime author of the scandal. As it happened to him in later life, the united testimony of many accusers was believed, and he was severely punished for a sin which he would have shuddered at the very thought of committing. His innocence was soon apparent.

After a time Henri's step-father, who was enjoying the full benefit of money to a portion of which the boy had by French law a direct claim, refused to give him any further assistance, and turned him out upon the world to beg. These were the beginnings in poverty and dereliction of a life which never was without its share in the cross. We cannot give the history of Henri Boudon's terrible trials. He was the victim for some years of a black conspiracy, and his chief slanderer, a priest and a religious, whom he won back to God by his meek endurance and the power of his prayer, confessed that sacerdotal jealousy had been the sole motive of the accusation. It must be added that the gossiping of "pious" ladies was the principal instrument in this work of darkness.

2. *A Year's Meditations.* By Mrs. A. Craven. Translated from the French. Kegan Paul and Co., 1881.

This volume is not an addition to the many manuals of Meditation which we already possess. It is not, technically speaking, a book of meditation at all—that is, the reflections which it contains are not cast into any form or divided into several “points,” nor are they proposed to the use of the reader in the ordinary sense. They form the spiritual journal, if we may so speak, of the author, they bear the mark of her individual constitution and circumstances, and they mention freely even the incidents of her life. Mrs. Craven is a writer who has already confided herself to the public to a very singular extent, and these meditations will not be unwelcome to the many readers of the *Récit d'une Sœur*.

We value them on two grounds. In the first place, these pages contain a large number of very striking and beautiful thoughts, a large proportion of which are practical as well as beautiful. They cannot fail to calm and raise the souls of those who read them, as they ought to be read slowly and by instalments, and on this ground we consider them as a precious addition to our contemporary spiritual literature. In the second place, they are the fruits of a practice of jotting down the thoughts which come to the mind in the course of spiritual reading or meditation—in the common sense of the word—a practice which cannot be too strongly recommended to thoughtful and intelligent minds. Of course, the chief value of this practice is in the impression which it makes on the minds of those who use it, and in the advantage with which it provides them of the use of such notes afterwards. But such notes are often very useful to others, as well as to their composers, and we cannot but be grateful in this particular instance to the kind friends who have assisted in the publication and translation of this most interesting volume.

3. *Dissertationes Selectæ in Historiam Ecclesiasticam.* Auctore Bernardo Jungmann, Eccl. Cath. Burg., Canon. Hon., &c., &c. Pustet, Ratisbon, New York, and Cincinnati, 1880.

Professor Jungmann is already well known to Catholic students by his excellent, though concise, treatises on theology. He has already published treatises *De Gratia*, *De Deo Uno et Trino*, *De Deo Creatore*, *De Novissimis*, *De Vera Religione*, and *De Verbo Incarnato*. He has now for some time been Professor

of Ecclesiastical History at Louvain, and this volume is the first public literary result of his labours in that sphere. The Dissertations are full of learning, clear in method, strong in argumentative power, and seem to us almost to exhaust their respective subjects. The volume contains altogether five of these Dissertations, and, when read consecutively, they will go far towards supplying an almost continuous history, at least a history of the main points of controversial interest in the first three centuries. The first Dissertation—which we recommend to the unfortunate Anglicans who have lately learned to form their faith upon the extremely inaccurate articles on “the Petrine Claims,” which have appeared in the pages of the *Church Quarterly*, and which are supposed to proceed from the singularly reliable pen of Dr. Littledale—is on the connection of St. Peter with the See of Rome. The second Dissertation passes in review the successive Roman Pontiffs of the first two centuries. The third is an elaborate review of the questions raised by the *Philosophumena*, ending with a discussion as to the authorship of that celebrated work, which Professor Jungmann is inclined to assign to Tertullian. The fourth Dissertation is devoted to St. Cyprian, and the last to Arianism and the Council of Nicæa.

### III.—NOTICES.

1. *A History of Religion.* The Evidences for the Divinity of the Christian Religion as furnished by its History, from the Creation of the World to our own times. Designed as a help to Catechetical Instruction in Schools and Churches. By Joseph Deharbe, S.J. Burns and Oates, 1881.—Father Deharbe's Catechisms are universally known as among the very best books of their kind, and it would be superfluous to sing their praises. The handsome and comprehensive volume before us, which is very well translated, is meant, we conceive, as a supplement to the Catechism properly so called. It will make its way as a standard book in all places of Catholic education.

2. *Elthia, or Etchings in Black and White.* By Mrs. Stuart Laidlaw. London, Burns and Oates, 1881.—This little story has been written with the object of placing on record, as it would seem, the author's very strong convictions on the virtues of Catholic negroes in the West Indies. Elthia is the daughter of the Governor of one of the islands and is brought up there, losing her mother when quite a young girl. At the end of the book we find her married to the successor of her father in the Government. The tale is slight, but prettily told, and, as we have said, makes a great deal of the amiable qualities of the blacks. The didactic element is not wanting, and the book will suit very well Catholic places of education.



3. *Foregleams of the Desired*. Sacred Verses, Hymns, and Translations. By H. A. Rawes, M.A., D.D., Oblate of St. Charles. Third Edition. Burns and Oates, 1881.—Father Rawes has a wide circle of admiring readers, and we need do no more than chronicle the appearance of this new edition of his little volume of sacred poems. They are far too thoughtful to be discussed in a cursory notice, and we are glad to see that they are appreciated.

4. *Lily, the Lost One*; or, the fatal effects of deception. By Miss K. M. Weld. Burns and Oates, 1881.—Lily, the lost one is not, as the title might imply, a girl who gets lost by practising deception. It is her father who deceives and gets into one trouble after another, and is punished by the loss first of his wife, and then of his only child, whom he never sees till he finds her on her death-bed in St. Elisabeth's Hospital. The main part of the story is occupied with the sufferings of the poor girl, whose mother dies at the beginning of the story at a roadside inn in Wales, leaving no clue to her name and connections. The story is gracefully told.

5. *Praelectiones dogmaticæ de Deo Uno* quas in C.R. Universitate Oenipontana habuit Ferdinandus Alois Stentrup, S.J. (Rauch) 1879.—This excellent theological treatise represents a certain part of the teaching imparted in the College of the Society of Jesus at Innsbruck. Deep and solid argument *de Deo Uno* was never surely more needed than in these days of pettifogging atheism, when every little pedant who has dabbled in science thinks himself qualified to deny his Maker.

6. *The Girl's Spiritual Calendar*. Translated from the French of the Author of *Golden Grains*. By Josephine M. Black. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son.—With a great deal of excellent advice contained in this pious "Girl's Own Book," there is a certain admixture of artificial spirituality which is not at home in its English dress, and which is not the product of experience gained by observation of convent teaching in England. It is not the fault of the translator that some of the suggestions are thoroughly French in tone and substance. Almost at the outset we find as a practical resolution the words: "I will tell my new companions how good our mistresses are." A child ought not to be told to say what it may very well happen that it does not think, and what moreover, since all nuns are not judicious and sweet-tempered, may in some cases possibly not be true. Children, like their elders, ought to be taught to think charitably, but on no account to speak insincerely. Above all things let us have simplicity of truth. Again, we cannot regard it as the duty of a good child to "recite the *Te Deum*" in thanksgiving to God for having brought "him or her" back to school. Such prescriptions form part of the process of putting old heads on young shoulders.







# BURNS AND OATES' SCHOOL AND STATIONERY LIST.

**Standard Reading Books for Catholic Schools.** Adapted to the  
Revised Code of 1871.

				£	s.	d.
Children's Primer.	Cloth.	Per doz.	.	.	0	3
Part I.	Cloth	.	.	.	0	1
Part II.	Cloth	.	.	.	0	2
Book I. for Standard 1.	Cloth	.	.	Per doz.	0	4
Book II.	" 2.	Cloth	.	.	0	5
Book III.	" 3.	Cloth	.	.	0	7
Book IV.	" 4.	Cloth	.	.	0	9
Book V. for Standards 5 and 6.	Cloth	.	.	.	0	12
Primer, Part I., stitched wrapper	.	.	.	.	0	1
Lesson Sheets, large type, per set	.	.	.	.	0	13

## HISTORY (CHURCH AND BIBLE).

**A History of Religion**, or the evidences for the divinity of the Christian Religion as furnished by its history, from the Creation of the World to our own times. Designed as a help to Catechetical Instruction in Schools and Churches. By JOSEPH DEHARBE, S.J. 648 pp., with foot and side notes, price 14s.

**An Abridgment of the Bible and Church History**, suitable for Schools. 1s. 4d.

**Manual of Church History**, approved by CARDINAL WISEMAN. 2s.

**Reeve and Challoner's Bible History.** 2s.

**Wenham. Readings from Old Testament.** 2 vols. 5s.

**New Testament Narrative.** 2s. 6d.

**Bible History.** By a Priest of Cincinnati. Illustrated. 2s.

**Historical Catechism or Chronology for Schools.** Cloth, 6d.; paper, 4d.

**Old Testament Stories.** 1s. 6d.

**Gospel Stories.** 1s. The two vols. together, 3s.

**Children's Bible History.** 210th thousand. Per dozen, 1s. 6d.

**Children's Explanatory Catechism.** 88 pp. 100th thousand. Per dozen, 1s. 6d.

**Children's Companion to Christian Doctrine.** 72 pp. Per dozen, 1s. 6d.

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES, 17 and 18 Portman Street, W.,  
and 63 Paternoster Row, E.C.

## ECCLESIASTICAL EMBROIDERY.

AN ENTIRELY NEW WORK.—Price £2 2s. net.—MOST ELEGANTLY BOUND.

### DRAWINGS OF ANCIENT EMBROIDERY. Thirty

Specimens of great beauty and interest, selected by Mrs. MARY BARBER, and executed in the First Style of Chromo-lithography. Edited by W. BUTTERFIELD, Esq., Architect.  
A very limited number still unsubscribed for.

LONDON: HENRY SOTHERAN and Co., Publishers, 36, Piccadilly; 136, Strand; 77 and 78, Queen Street, City. MANCHESTER: 49, Cross Street.

WORKS BY THE REV. H. J. COLERIDGE.

---

*The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier.*

Vol. I. 7s. 6d. Vol. II. 10s. 6d.

*Vita Vitæ Nostræ Meditantibus Proposita.*

Cloth, 7s. 6d. ; calf, 10s. 6d.

*The Life of our Life: a Harmony of the Gospels.*

In Two Vols. Price 15s.

*The Public Life of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

Vol. I. "THE MINISTRY OF ST. JOHN BAPTIST." Second Edition. 6s. 6d.

Vol. II. "THE PREACHING OF THE BEATITUDES." Second Edition. 6s. 6d.

Vol. III. "THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT." 6s. 6d.

Vol. IV. "THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT" (concluded). 6s. 6d.

Vol. V. "THE TRAINING OF THE APOSTLES" (Part I.). 6s. 6d.

---

*The Chronicle of St. Anthony of Padua.*

"THE ELDEST SON OF ST. FRANCIS." In Four Books. Price 5s. 6d.

---

LONDON :

BURNS & OATES, PORTMAN STREET AND PATERNOSTER ROW.

ST. JOSEPH'S LIBRARY, 48, SOUTH STREET, W.

s.

nd

nd

ed.

ed.

ce